THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA,

No. LXVIII.

AND

BIBLICAL REPOSITORY

No. CXX.

OCTOBER, 1860.

ARTICLE I.

THE RELIGION OF GEOLOGY.[1]

Every important discovery in art, science, or theology, is met with incredulity, and often persecution, by the world; and the unfortunate discoverers are exposed to ridicule and penury, if not, like Galileo, to imprisonment. Some have learned wisdom by experience, and have refused to announce to the world important truths they have subsequently discovered. Those who have sought to illustrate the text and doctrines of our most holy Bible from the fields of science, have too often been met by the smile of derision, or the spirit of denunciation. But when discoveries have been finally appreciated, the public have seized upon them enthusiastically, as if there had never been any odium connected with their propounding. So the church is beginning, more and more, to appreciate the value of science as auxiliary to interpretation, and theologians cannot now pass through the curriculum of study, without devoting much attention to the connection between science and religion.

Yet there are three classes of opinions upon this sub-

[1] The Religion of Geology and its connected sciences. By Edward Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D., Late President of Amherst College and Professor of Natural Theology and Geology. A New Edition, with an Additional Lecture, giving a summary of the author's present views of the whole subject. Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company. 1859.

ject in the community. The first and most numerous embrace those who receive the Bible as a book inspired to teach the absolute essence of scientific as well as religious truth; who regard the language of inspiration as strictly scientific; and who therefore denounce all attempts to modify the interpretation of the Bible by science as infidel. Some of this class have entered upon a crusade, as it were, against geologists; inundating the religious world with invincible books, pamphlets, and articles in quarterlies. None of them are practically acquainted with geology, but they have read geological works, chiefly with a view to their refutation; and, therefore, have imperfect and one-sided views of the phenomena. Hence their *revised* theories, to explain these phenomena, are very crude. For example: some of them are shrewd enough to see that, if they allow that the accumulations of gravel and pebbles lying upon the surface of the earth were deposited by water, they must admit the conclusions of geologists as to the great length of time required for the formation of all the stratified rocks. Therefore they assign to them an igneous origin; that is, that they were thrown up from beneath the surface, like lava from volcanoes.

Another writer, apparently more advanced, is willing to admit that the earth was once in a state of igneous fusion; for, says he, there are proofs that the surface was once soft. It was so yielding that birds walked upon it; their tracks remaining to this day to attest it. In other words, these wonderful animals — huge birds, reptiles, and batrachians, as well as small insects — walked over this ocean of plastic lava without injury to the integuments of their feet, reared their young, and lived, for ages, upon this fiery furnace!

The same writer is willing to go a step further. Having proved the former fusion of the earth by the argument of the ichnites, he argues that the diameter of the earth must have been much greater than at present, in consequence of its expansion by heat. On account of this increase in bulk, the revolution of the earth upon its axis must have occupied a longer time than it does now. Hence, as there is a controversy respecting the length of the demiurgic days, some call-

ing them ordinary days, others long periods, this view presents a day intermediate in length between the others, which may be adopted as a compromise between them, adequate to explain all the difficulties. Men who hold these views are astonished that no one attempts to answer their arguments!

Some of this class exhibit a charitable spirit towards the innovators, which is truly commendable. They entreat them to reconsider their views, if they would save their souls. In the preface to the new edition, Professor Hitchcock publishes a letter sent to him by an English clergyman of this class, exhorting him to repentance. Says he: "I am loath to publish anything [against your views] without first addressing a few lines to you, entreating you, for your soul's sake, and for the sake of the eternal welfare of others, to reconsider, with earnest prayer to God, the assertions you have made. I cannot but behold you in the fearfully perilous circumstances of having made yourself an antagonist to God. I know he is marvellously long suffering; and a perusal of your book has impressed the thought more strongly than ever on my soul, how patient and forbearing God is; for I must, in honesty tell you, that I never before read a work which so presumptuously calls his word in question, or treats it with such contempt. I am sure you are not aware of this. I give you full credit for not knowing what you are about."

The second class of opinions embraces those who either reject the authority of Christianity entirely, as sceptics and atheists; or those who deny the authority of the Pentateuch. They are not at all troubled to find difficulties in the Mosaic history, or at any of the apparent discrepancies between science and revelation. The author of the Religion of Geology had been told that his views would be quite acceptable to this class. Hence a critique upon this work, which appeared in a dozen weekly issues of the Boston Investigator, was the most gratifying of all the notices of his book which he had seen. The critic had so great a spite against the author, that he would fly, at once, from a review of the work itself to a personal assault. Thus he says: "In my last letter, I exhibited you as an archangel ruined, not a goblin

damned. I informed you that I had not left you. True to my word and the cause of truth, I am come again. I hear you say: 'Give me credit for honest and good intentions.' I cannot, I will not do it.

"I regard you, in reference to the future, the same as would an impartial and independent historian that of Talleyrand, had he been writing his history in his day, after he had, as you have, well nigh run his career. He would have given him all credit as a shrewd, talented, able, and successful financier, uniting foresight with amazing tact and unblushing impudence; but as a man, one of absolute selfishness and hypocrisy. Always able, always successful, the historian would have given demonstration of the truth of his delineation and narration, by a series of facts, which would have forced conviction. I am writing your history," etc.

This extract shows with how great loathing and abhorrence the views of this book are received by infidels. How strange it must seem to an author to receive such earnest attacks from such opposite sources! In these cases, one of the parties must surely be mistaken in its bearing; and the author suggests that, till they can settle this question, he shall rest quietly. "Like an acid and an alkali, in chemistry, the two attacks neutralize each other, and leave me unharmed."

The third class of writers believe fully in the inspiration of every part of the Bible, and in the truth of the leading principles of science; and that these two records are not discrepant, but mutually illustrate and confirm each other. Such is the ground taken by the Religion of Geology. In the midst of vituperative attacks, it must have been a source of consolation to its author, that he has also received, from more enlightened quarters, words of encouragement and expressions of thanks for the relief afforded, by these reasonings, to minds struggling long in the midst of doubt.[1]

---

[1] The book has been the occasion of good in another way. We learn that the suggestion in the Preface to the Religion of Geology, that professorships of natural theology in connection with the natural sciences should be united with our theological seminaries, led the Rev. Dr. Lyon, of Columbus, Mississippi, to make efforts to have one endowed at Columbia, South Carolina. Hon. John

There is a false notion prevalent respecting the science of geology. Its principles are thought to be unsettled and constantly changing: it is supposed that the science is made up of conflicting hypotheses, and that there is no agreement among its standard writers. This opinion may arise, partly from the fact that many hypotheses have been put forth in the name of geology, which are generally condemned; and partly because geological discussions are mainly confined to the comparatively unimportant theories yet unsettled. The doctrines fully established, are those which bear directly upon religion. And they are as well settled as the theory of the earth's diurnal and annual motions in astronomy, or the doctrine of definite proportions in chemistry. The most important of these principles are the following: the whole accessible crust of the globe has undergone entire, and ofttimes repeated, metamorphoses since the rocks were created; enormous erosions have taken place upon the earth since it was consolidated; existing continents, by slow vertical movements, have been below the ocean several times; processes are now going on, around us, capable of producing nearly all the known varieties of rock, with the aid of water and heat; water and heat have been the grand agents of all geological changes; the whole globe has once been in a state of igneous fusion; there was a time when no animals or plants existed on the earth; several distinct economies of life, or groups of animals and plants, have occupied the surface, each adapted to the altered condition of things; these ancient races have been unlike one another, and, with a few exceptions, in the highest formations, unlike those now alive, the resemblance between living and fossil types becoming more unlike as we descend; some ten or twelve miles thickness of fossiliferous rocks were deposited previous to the creation of man, who was among the last of the animals that have appeared upon the globe; and, finally, amid all the di-

Perkins, of Mississippi, gave $30,000 as an endowment, and the professorship will shortly be filled, and the experiment tried. We hope the example may be followed by other liberal minded men of means, until all our theological seminaries are supplied with such professorships.

versities of organic structure, and change of species, genera, and families, in different formations, the features of one great system of life can be seen running through the whole series, linking all past minor systems together and to the existing races, and showing the one grand plan of creation, as it lay originally in the Divine Mind.

We proceed to state the positions advanced in the last edition of the Religion of Geology, under six general divisions: I. The arguments drawn from science to prove the existence of God. II. The modifications required, by geology, of the interpretation of those parts of the Bible relating to the past and future history of the earth. III. Arguments from geology, for the divine benevolence. IV. Miraculous and special providence. V. Fallen condition of the world, as illustrated by science. VI. The new and enlarged views, afforded by science, of the divine plans.

I. *The Existence of God.* Geology furnishes a new phase of the argument for the existence of the deity from design. That argument assumes a beginning to the existing system of nature, organic and inorganic. Though geology cannot prove the original creation of matter out of nothing, it does show that there was a beginning to the present economy of life. It shows that matter has been moulded into ten thousand forms, so exquisite, with such wise and wonderful adaptations, that only an infinite Deity could have done it; especially since the still more wonderful powers of life, and instinct, and intellect, have been added to organism. Without injury to theism, we may give up, to the atheist, his eternal matter and its laws; for, not till he has endowed those laws with all the attributes of deity, could he people that world with living beings.

In the modifications of matter, then, which constitute the chief beauty and glory of the world, do we find full proof of a creating Deity; and in the wise and exact adaptation of one thing to another, and especially in the modifications of structure to adapt animals and plants to a changing world, we see evidence of a personal Deity. For a blind, unintelligent force, like law, could not have made such alterations

in the successive races, and made them wisely. Geology, then, in the very argument by which it proves the existence of God, shows the absurdity of pantheism, as well as every other form of atheism.

Let us examine, now, the hinge upon which all our arguments for the existence of the Deity depend, the *beginning of things*. The eternity of the world, and the eternal and necessary development of all things, from one another, are the foundation of the atheistic system, and it becomes us to look well to our positions here. Many minds are sincerely disposed to doubt the force of all arguments, furnished by abstract reasoning, to reply to this question, viz. from the world's contingency, and from the absurdity of supposing an infinite series of finite beings.

Matter, says the atheist, is eternal, and all its changes proceed in cycles, which never had a beginning, and will never have an end. Even though you prove that the earth has passed through a series of changes, from liquid fire to a condition fit for the residence of successive tribes of organisms, this series is only one of a vast number of similar cycles. Man existed before the present system; but he and all his works were consumed by fiery agencies. Matter, after the destruction of life, has certain tendencies to produce organisms; which, in their turn, give place to higher forms of life, until man appears again, preceded by thousands of generations of his less perfect ancestors.

Now the most important and fundamental principle, upon which this argument depends, is this (and it is a principle that we are all disposed to adopt, without perceiving its disastrous tendencies): germs and tendencies to form worlds and organic races, may have existed in matter previous to the existence of life and organisms. Hume says: "for aught we can know *à priori*, matter may contain the source or spring of order originally within itself, as well as mind does: and there is no more difficulty in conceiving that the several elements, from an internal, unknown cause, may fall into the most exquisite arrangements, than to conceive that their ideas, in the great universal mind, from a like in-

ternal, unknown cause, fall into that arrangement." If we admit that the highest exertions of matter, in any form, can produce the feeblest organism, we cannot stand before the atheist an instant, and we destroy the prime distinctions which constitute the framework of the natural sciences. For if matter can produce the feeblest organism, that organism can reproduce its like; and it is an easy if not inevitable inference to say, then, that these organisms can give birth to others higher on the scale, even though it be only infinitesimally higher. There will be a gradual rise in the scale; and there will be no stopping-place until man is developed from the highest of the inferior animals. This is the hypothesis of *creation by law.*

To defend this hypothesis, atheism makes a confident appeal to geology. For that science teaches that, since animals and plants first appeared on the globe, there has been a marked upward progress in the races that have succeeded one another. In the lowest Silurian, invertebrate animals and flowerless marine plants alone appear. In the upper Silurian, a few fishes, the lowest vertebrate animals, are found. But not till we rise into the Devonian, is there even a trace of reptiles, nor do birds appear at all, till we ascend to the Jurassic series; and these perhaps, as their tracks indicate,with characters somewhat peculiar. Nor do the Mammalia show themselves, a few marsupials excepted, till we reach the Tertiary; nor were the human race introduced till a late period in the Alluvial formation. The plants show a similar progress from the less to the more perfect; while a corresponding improvement was going on in the inorganic world. What do these facts indicate, but this gradual development?

The hypothesis fails in several essential points. While there has been progress in the organic, because the same is true of the inorganic, world, there is not the slightest evidence of any gradual change of one species, or genus, or family, into another; but each species of fossil animal or plant is just as distinct from every other, as in existing nature; whereas, if this hypothesis were true, we ought to find endless interme-

diate varieties. Moreover, the species, in one formation, ought to pass insensibly into those of the formation above; whereas there is often not even a similarity. Again, there is sometimes a retrogradation of the races, from the more to the less perfect, as we ascend in the formations. Some of the ancient fishes were of a higher grade than their successors: so was it with the reptiles, and with the cephalopod mollusks, which retrograded from the compound to the simple.

If the most powerful species of mollusk or articulate animal could not produce the lowest organism among the vertebrates, which is inferior to it, much more, *à fortiori*, matter could not, by its utmost exertions, produce the feeblest organism. Matter has not, and cannot produce, life; nor even such a collocation of particles as will form a lifeless organism. Creative power is the only cause to which science can refer as the cause. Upon this point, geology is more biblical than many metaphysicians.

Thus we see that the advance has been by creative acts, not by infinitesimal development. Let us now examine the hypothesis of the eternal series.

Preliminary principles: 1. Our argument does not require that we shall show that the matter of the world has been created out of nothing by the Deity, if we can only prove that matter has undergone such modifications as Deity alone could accomplish; that is, that the great cycles of nature have been *interrupted* in their natural course.

2. If we can prove that any of the great systems of organic life on the globe, or in any one zoological district, had a beginning; or, in other words, that there was a time when they did not exist, we show an exigency to have existed, demanding a being of infinite power, wisdom, and benevolence, to create and adapt to circumstances such races of creatures. If their structure and adaptation do not demand a Deity, neither would the production of matter require his agency.

3. If we can show that any important genera or species of animals or plants did not once exist; their creation demands a Deity, and proves that the whole organic system upon the globe had a beginning. For, such is the connec-

tion and mutual influence of the different races, that a single new species could not be introduced without disturbing the harmony of the whole, and producing, thus, the ruin of the whole, unless Infinite Wisdom should interpose to prevent such a result. And to create one animal, or plant, demands the same infinite attributes as to create a whole race.

4. If we can prove the extinction of even one species of organic beings, and much more of many species, we show a tendency to ruin in the system of organic life, of which they form a part, and consequently a beginning to the same; since any system tending to decay cannot be eternal. The disappearance of even one species, on this principle, would disturb the harmony of the whole, and tend to its entire extinction.

Arguments: A. Geology shows that there was a time when the whole globe was in a state of fusion from heat; and, of course, destitute of organic life. Some power besides matter, or law, is requisite to prepare this ball of fire for inhabitants, and then to produce the different races.

B. Since the introduction of life upon the earth, there have been several distinct groups or economies of animals and plants, which have successively appeared and passed away. Not less than six of these groups have been so distinct from one another, that no species is common to any two of them. The creation of these successive races is such an interruption in the cycle, that it can be explained only by the interposition of an infinite Deity.

C. All agree that man was not created till after the tertiary period; and, judging from chronological records, about six thousand years ago. The most perfect being of all the creatures enters suddenly upon the arena of life, with no antecedents to connect him with previous existences, either physically or mentally. The creation of man is the greatest event in the earth's history. If this does not require an interruption of the cycle of ages, surely nothing else can.

D. Since the commencement of the Alluvial period, several animals have become extinct: for example the mastodon, the dodo, and the gigantic birds of New Zealand. Now, as already explained, so many examples of the disap-

pearance of species, shows a tendency to ruin in the system, and consequently a beginning to it; since no such system of decay can be eternal. The present economy of life, then, had a beginning; which is also proved by the absence of the relics of existing animals, in the formations beneath the Tertiary.

E. Astronomical argument: Certain comets are retarded in their motions through space. This proves the existence of some rarefied substance, in space, which, is of necessity, a resisting medium. The solar system, therefore, cannot have existed always; for, if this had existed from eternity, even the planets would, ere this, have emptied themselves into the sun.

Conclusions: 1. The first four arguments prove a beginning to organic life; the fifth, a beginning to the solar system.

2. To produce organic life, the interposition of Deity is required. Therefore

3. The world has not existed in an eternal series of cycles.

4. To create animals and regulate the motions of the universe, as much requires an infinite Deity, as the creation of matter out of nothing.

5. Hence it is not necessary, for our argument, to prove the creation of matter. We are not, however, without some proof of the origination of matter from the will of the Deity.

II. *Interpretation of those parts of the Bible relating to the physical history of the earth.* Geology throws light upon the scriptural statements respecting the *age of the world, its cosmogony or mode of formation, the Noachian deluge, the introduction of suffering and death, and its final destruction by fire.*

Much has been written, of late, concerning cosmogony. As Professor Hitchcock treats this subject from the scientific side, and as he suggests some new views, such as are required by science, we shall enlarge upon this subject, and quote several passages from the new Lecture. He says:

"1. *The Bible does not fix the time when the world was created.*

"It says that *in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.* And surely this does not fix the time of the event, but shows only that some time or other these heavens and this earth began to be; that is, they were not eternal, as many heathen philosophers supposed; there was a time when God *had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest parts of the dust of the world* — that is, the elements. It has, indeed, been usually understood that the beginning spoken of by Moses is so connected with the six days' work, that we must regard it as coëval with the first of those days, and, if those be regarded as literal days, and the chronology of man as reaching back only about six thousand years, the beginning must have nearly the same age. But it can never be proved that the days were not separated from the beginning by an indefinite interval. If so, that interval may have been incalculably long — long enough to satisfy all the demands of geology.

"2. *The Bible does fix the time when man first appeared on the globe.*

"The Bible distinctly represents man as the last animal created; and, since no other species of men had been previously placed on the earth, we may reasonably presume that the place assigned him on the Mosaic roll of creation may be regarded as chronologically exact. Now, the scriptures carry forward a series of chronological dates, commencing with man, to the time of Christ, and thus link the time of his creation with the history of the race.

"It is quite probable that the chronological date of the cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth, created on the sixth day, was intended to be fixed. For geology shows that those which were man's contemporaries were far more abundant and varied than all that had before appeared. But some did appear much earlier; and how was it possible for the sacred writer to give the time when all of them appeared, unless he had appended a table of dates? But more on this subject under a subsequent head.

"3. *The Bible represents the creation as the special result of Jehovah's efficiency, to the exclusion of every other cause.*

"Doubtless the writer had specially in mind the gods of the heathen supposed by them to be the authors of the universe. But the language applies equally well to any other agency, such, for instance, as a law of nature, which has been supposed capable of the creation of organic races. All is excluded as a creative power save Jehovah's fiat.

"Geology teaches the same lesson. It finds the successive races in the different formations to have come in by groups, at once, so as divine creating power can alone explain. If law had done it, as some contend, we ought to find all the gaps filled up by uninterrupted series. Here is another interesting coincidence between the natural and the revealed record.

"4. *The Bible represents God as employing instrumentalities in the work of creation.*

"He commanded the earth to bring forth grass, and herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit, on the third day, and the waters every living thing that moveth, on the fifth. His own efficiency was, indeed, the

power that enabled the soil and the waters to execute their commission. Still they were instruments; nor can we say how long or how extensively they were employed. If we inquire of the geological records, their testimony is, that immense periods were consumed in the preparation, by natural operations, of the earth, the water, and the air, for their inhabitants.

"5. *The Bible teaches us that the creation was a gradual work, completed by successive exhibitions of divine power, with intervals of repose.* How long the intervals were will depend upon the meaning which we attach to the word *day*. But, if it were only twenty-four hours, the acts of creation would still be successive, and the work progressive.

"Here, too, geology corresponds closely with the scriptures. It distinctly shows us epochs of creative action with long intervals of repose. The intervals are, indeed, of vast duration, and the creative interventions, probably, more numerous than those mentioned in Genesis. But the fact of successive creations, not their number, is the chief lesson taught us by the two records. And it is one of great interest, because, *a priori*, we should conclude that all organic beings would be commanded into existence by one instantaneous fiat of Jehovah.

"6. *The Bible describes the emergence of the land from the waters before the creation of animals and plants.* And so does geology. It tells us, indeed, of very many such vertical movements of continents. Yet, to men in general, even in our day, this geological doctrine is regarded as very doubtful. How strange, if Moses were uninspired, that he should bring it out so distinctly!

"7. *The Bible does not describe a chaos, in the popular acceptation of that term.* It declares, indeed, that the earth was without form and void; which means, as the commentators say, invisible, or waste, and unfurnished; invisible, because covered by water; unfurnished, because destitute of animals and plants. But the common notion of a chaos is, that it consists of "a confused assemblage of elements," not governed by the same chemical and electrical laws as now prevail. Now, geology shows clearly that the matter of the globe has never been free from the same laws that now govern it; for we have abundant products, in the hypozoic rocks, of the supposed chaotic period, and they all show the controlling power of the laws of chemistry and crystallography, in the production of the most beautiful gems and other crystalline forms. Geology and the Bible, then, agree, in spite of bad translations and the fancies of heathen philosophers, in excluding chaos from the works of God.

"8. *By comparing geology and the Bible, we learn that the earth had a very early revolution on its axis in twenty-four hours.*

"On the first day, immediately following the sublime mandate, *Let there be light, and there was light*, we find God dividing the light from the darkness, and he called the light day, and the darkness he called night. This has seemed strange to commentators, because the sun and moon were not created till the fourth day. And yet it would seem difficult to avoid the conclusion that there was thus early some movement of the earth or the

heavens producing an alternation of day and night. If we turn to geology, we shall find that it was in fact the same diurnal revolution of the earth which now takes place, and occupying the same period too. For we find the earth flattened at the poles, exactly to the amount, according to La Place, which would be the result of the revolution of a fluid globe in twenty-four hours. And geology makes it almost certain that the earth was in that condition, from intense heat, at a very early period. After it became solid, no such effect, to much extent, would result from a revolution on its axis. We may, with confidence therefore, infer that the earth's revolution in twenty-four hours began as early as the time when it was in a molten state. If the revolution had been more rapid then than now, the poles would have been more flattened than they are; if less rapid, the oblateness would have been less. The revolution, therefore, must have occupied neither more nor less than twenty-four hours.

"This is an interesting coincidence between geology and revelation. But it is fatal to an opinion that has been quite popular, and still plays an important part in some theories, *viz.*, that before the fourth day the standard of measurement for the day, and therefore its length, must have been quite different from what they were afterwards. This is the grand argument on which some rely to prove the days of creation to have been long periods.[1] Alas for the theorist! the facts of science show that it has no foundation.

"9. *My next position is, that the Mosaic account of the creation admits of an indefinite period between the beginning and the first demiurgic day.*

"The first verse merely asserts the creation of matter at some unknown epoch. The second verse describes its condition as without form and void, covered with water and with darkness. Then commences a description of the first day's work; the Spirit of God brooding over the face of the waters, and the evolution of light. But who can tell how long it may have continued in a waste and unfurnished condition? or who can say but previous to the chaotic state it may have been again and again reduced to order, and have even been the seat of several economies of life — of all those changes, organic and inorganic, which geology discloses? It is no very unusual thing in scripture for events, and even centuries, to be dropped out between two consecutive verses, and those linked together as if in immediate succession, which, in fact, were widely separated. It may be so here; and the chaotic condition described in verse second may not have been the waste and unfurnished states the earth had experienced earlier; but only that condition immediately preceding the creation described in the six days' work. This would be the view adopted by those who will admit the six demiurgic days to be only common days of twenty-four hours. They would place all the fossil animals and plants in that vast undefined interval which may have existed between the beginning and the first day, while the six days' work was limited to the existing races. Yet even those who suppose the days to have been long periods, admit of this long, indefinite interval between the first and second verses. (See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xiv. p. 92.)

[1] See the "Six Days of Creation," by Professor Tayler Lewis.

"But, if the sacred narrative does not fix the epoch of the creation of matter; if an interval of indefinite length may have preceded the six days' work; if those six days may have been natural days, what more do we need, especially when we add the other points of coincidence which I have described, — what more, I inquire, do we need, to bring the geological into full harmony with the biblical record? It is sufficient, answer Dr. Chalmers, Dr. J. Pye Smith, Dr. Buckland, Dr. Harris, Dr. King, Professor Sedgwick, and many others. It may have been perfectly adequate in 1814, answers Hugh Miller, but was found in 1839 to be no longer so, on account of new discoveries in geology. One was, that, in the geological history of the earth, immediately preceding the appearance of the existing races, there is no evidence of the occurrence of a period of death and darkness; but, on the contrary, the tertiary passes into the alluvial, and the earlier alluvial into the historic period, quietly and without disorder. The other discovery is, that some of the animals and plants of tertiary days have been continued to the present time, and still live. Is it not evident, then, that the six days' work must have reached back much farther than six thousand years?

"These statements of Hugh Miller have been widely received as settling the question as to the date of the six days' work, and showing the inadequacy of the theory of Dr. Chalmers and others to reconcile Genesis and geology. But, with all due deference to his eminent ability and sagacity, I cannot regard his objections as insuperable.[1] Are we sure that the waste and desolate state of the globe immediately preceded the work of the first day? or may it have lain far back among the ages of the indefinite period intervening between the beginning and the first day? or was there not, in most northern countries, a time of disorder and ruin as great as that referred to in scripture, during the drift period, and even during a considerable portion of the alluvial or modified drift period? Most geologists believe that during the drift period northern countries generally were below the ocean, and swept over by northern oceanic currents loaded with icebergs. I have adduced facts to show that the United States were two thousand feet below the waters at that time; and Professor Ramsey has shown the same in respect to Wales, and, of course, all England. What greater disturbance than this, according to scripture, preceded man's creation?

"And as to many of the tertiary and earlier alluvial species being found among the present races, what is there in scripture to forbid the supposition that they may have been permitted to live on from the earlier into the

[1] "I have ventured in this lecture, on two points, to call in question the correctness of Hugh Miller's views. But I hope it will not hence be thought that I differ from him in the leading principles of his Testimony of the Rocks; for I cordially embrace them; especially his theory of the days of creation; and regard this work as a most valuable addition to the religion of geology. I object only to some of the illustrations of his arguments."

historic period? Or why may not God have recreated the same species in some cases, as he assuredly would do, if there were no reason to alter the type, and as he seems to have done in different localities among existing species? Certain it is that, when I adopted this mode of reconciling the records some forty years ago, I was acquainted with some of the facts which Mr. Miller speaks of as recent discoveries; and they did not seem sufficient to invalidate the theory; nor do they now.

"There is, however, another difficulty in respect to this theory not mentioned by Miller, but stated with great force by Professor Silliman, a quarter of a century since, which has always perplexed me more than any other. Any one who reads the Mosaic account without prejudice, cannot but get the impression that, though brief, it does embrace the whole history of creation, organic and inorganic, from the production of matter to the formation of man. It begins with a period when an uninhabited ocean covers the surface, and then, ere life is introduced, light breaks in upon the darkness, and the land emerges. All this corresponds to the immensely long processes which geology shows the earth to have gone through. But how improbable that a continent should be upheaved and rendered habitable in one or two literal days! And then, the work of the fourth day, the creation or appointment of the sun, and moon, and stars to their circuits, comes in naturally if we take this broad view, and imagine ourselves far back in the history of the universe; but how apparently out of place in a creation limited to six literal days!

"It is the pressure of this difficulty that has led many able men to seek an expansion of the demiurgic week by regarding the days as either figuratively or symbolically long periods. I am not sure that this is necessary to a satisfactory vindication of the Bible, or that the Chalmerian theory is insufficient. Yet I incline to the opinion that the time has come when we may advance a few steps towards a better understanding of the nature of the demiurgic days.

"Ever since I began to read the Mosaic account with reference to geology, more than forty years ago, two facts have been more and more strongly impressed upon my mind in respect to the days. One is, that Moses understood them, and meant his hearers to understand them, as literal days. The other is, that they are in reality, or stand as the representatives of, something quite different. The earth's submergence during the first day, and emergence on the third, if we can judge from geological changes of analogous character, could have been no twenty-four or even seventy-two hour processes, but rather requiring untold ages. So geology teaches us that all the great classes of plants were introduced only after immense intervals, whereas Moses brings them all in upon a single day.

We give, next, the substance of the symbolical theory, as it is drawn out in the South Danvers Lecture.

10. We may understand the days as symbolically repre-

senting indefinite periods. A symbol is the representative of something else. The word is taken, in all respects, in its literal signification ; yet it has a higher meaning. Moses probably understood, and meant his readers should understand, the days of creation as literal days : but they actually symbolize higher periods : just as days, weeks, and times, are used in prophecy (which often has a symbolic form), for years.

The great advantage of this view of the subject, over that which makes the days a figurative representation of long periods, is that hereby we can take the scriptural statement in its plain literal sense ; yet those literal days may be stretched, by symbolism, over the widest periods which geology shows to have separated the divine creative acts. It is no error, if a man chooses to understand these six days of creation as literal days ; nor any error for the geologist to make them symbolic of vast periods.

11. The biblical account of creation may be regarded as a succession of pictures, with existing nature on the foreground. Ever since this pictorial method was suggested by Dr. Knapp, in 1789, it has been a favorite mode of representation among authors, the most brilliant of which was made by Hugh Miller. But, three errors have generally pervaded these representations : The first is, that the six pictures in Genesis embrace every geological change the earth has undergone ; secondly, that they are given in true chronological order ; and, thirdly, that in the life-pictures, the plants and animals now found fossil — not the existing species — occupy the foreground. Inextricable confusion and discrepancy have resulted from the mixture of such elements. But admit that the sacred writer intended to give only certain prominent scenes in creation — its most important *memorabilia* — and not always in true chronological order, and that existing animals and plants were the models before him, the fossil species coming in on the background only by implication, and all the pictures become luminous, beautiful, and harmonious.

12. By such a mode of description, the sacred writer was not bound to give, and indeed could not give always, the

true chronological order of creation. To make this evident, we subjoin a table, prepared by the author, exhibiting, in

	Man.	Man.	
6 Day.	Mammals and Land Reptiles.	Full Fauna and Flora.	Alluvium.
		Mollusca. Articulata. Mammals. Dicotyledons.	Tertiary.
5 Day.	Birds. Sea Animals.	Radiata. Mollusca.	Chalk.
		Birds. Reptiles.	Oölite.
		Reptiles.	Trias.
4 Day.	Sun, Moon, and Stars created.	Saurian Reptiles.	Permian.
		Dicotyledons. Acrogens.	Carboniferous.
		Batrachians. Fishes. Monocotyledons.	Devonian.
3 Day.	Plants of all sorts. Land emerges.	Fishes.	
2 Day.	Atmosphere created.	Articulata. Radiata. Mollusca. Algae.	Silurian and Cambrian.
1 Day.	Light, Darkness and Ocean.	Mostly Ocean.	Azoic.
		Igneous Fluidity.	

parallel columns, the principal events, as they are revealed by the sacred penman and by geology.

The right-hand column gives a fair view of the order of creation, as developed by geology, the names of the several classes of animal and vegetable life being given where they first appear, and their greatest development by small capitals. The left-hand column gives the principal results of the six days' work, according to scripture, and where there seems to be no doubt of parallelism, they are placed opposite to events in the geological record. An examination of this table leads to several important conclusions :

a. We learn that some events, found in one column, do not occur in the other. The igneous fluidity of the earth is one of the best established conclusions of geology, but it is not named in the Bible. The introduction of numerous groups of animals and plants at different periods, is another settled fact in geology; but the scriptures name only one creation of the great classes. On the other hand, the creation of the atmosphere, on the second day, and of the sun, moon, and stars, upon the fourth, have no counterpart in the geological record.

b. There are several rather striking coincidences between the two records, as to the order of events, and the kinds of organisms introduced. Both show us, in early times, the continents beneath the ocean, and subsequently lifted out of it. Birds and sea-animals are introduced on the fifth day, which may reasonably correspond to oölitic times, when birds and reptiles appeared, in large numbers, if we may depend upon the tracks of the former as proof. Land-reptiles and mammals, or quadrupeds do not appear till the sixth day, which may well be regarded as synchronous with the tertiary series, when, according to geology, they were first fully developed. Man, too, in both records, is represented as the last animal created : a coincidence of great interest.

c. There also exist several diversities in the two records, as to the nature and order of events. They are not to be regarded as discrepancies; for they are so different, in nature, as to be incapable of being compared. Thus, the creation of the atmosphere is represented as occupying the whole of the demiurgic day. But geology has no record of such an

event, and therefore no comparison can be instituted. The same is true of the creation of the sun and moon, on the fourth day. It does seem remarkable, however, that these luminaries should be represented as created, not until after the vegetable world, on the third day, if the writer had intended to present the true chronological order of events. No impostor would have been so short-sighted as to commit such a blunder; hence there must be some other reason for such an arrangement. Alike strange is it to find the creation of the atmosphere placed so much before that of the heavenly bodies, when these, as things now are, seem to be indispensable to atmospheric phenomena.

d. The most important conclusion drawn from this table, is, that the sacred writer did not and could not give the true chronological order of events. The different classes of animals and plants, according to the geological record, appeared at different periods, the same class often several times repeated, and with different degrees of development. Thus plants began with the lowest class, the Algae, and were not numerous in the Cambrian slates, the oldest of fossiliferous rocks. In the Devonian series, a few monocotyledonous plants appeared. In the Carboniferous, there was an immense development of acrogens or flowerless trees, and some dicotyledons. The latter, however, the most perfect of plants, were not fully developed till the Tertiary, and still more fully in Alluvium. Yet plants are all represented as having been created on the third day. How was it possible, then, to give the chronological date, or order of their creation, unless the sacred writer had gone into the scientific details thus alluded to? The same is true of the groups of animals, which, in the Bible, are more comprehensive and indefinite than those of science, because they are such as are in popular use. By the plan of the inspired writer, the time and order of their appearance could not be given; and therefore the discovery of any diversity, in this respect, between revelation and science, is no objection to the former, because it is not responsible for the time and order of events, but only for their truth. And if this is so in regard to the organic world, why may it not

be so in regard to the other events described? Moses wished to give a pictorial representation of some of the principal events in the work of creation, and therefore he conformed to the chronological order only so far as his leading object required. It would be natural for him to begin his pictures with the world in a chaotic state, buried by darkness and water, with the light just breaking in. According to ancient ideas, there was an ocean above as well as below; and this might have suggested the formation of the firmament on the second picture. It was natural, next, to bring up the submerged land, and adorn it with vegetation. This might awaken the thought of introducing the heavenly bodies. And now it might occur that everything was ready for the introduction of animals into the atmosphere and the waters; and, last of all, to let the most perfect of animals come in with man.

These may not be, and probably were not, the reasons why, as we suppose, Moses departed from a chronological arrangement of his six pictures; but they may show that there might be reasons for doing this. It has been, and still is, almost universally assumed, that Moses gives a connected and chronological history of creation; and then ingenuity has been taxed to the utmost, to accommodate the facts to such a supposition. But if we may reasonably suppose that he meant only to give certain leading and selected facts, conformed to a chronological order only so far as suited his purpose; just as one might select certain facts from the early history of the country, and show them, by pictures, arranged so as to produce the best effect without reference to dates, it relieves the sacred writer from all responsibility as to chronological order and scientific arrangement; and really does more to bring out the beauty of the Mosaic history of creation, and to bring it into harmony with science, than almost all other principles.

A few concluding remarks of considerable importance we present in the language of the lecture:

"(1.) *This theory of interpretation allows us to retain the literalities of the Mosaic account.*

"I cannot believe that any man of unbiassed judgment can read that ac-

count and not feel that Moses is writing a literal history. The objects about which he writes are all of them real existences, which were before him, and he seems to be giving an account of their creation in the simplest possible language. Now, to be told that he understood the word *day* to be a period of indefinite length, and meant his readers so to understand it, seems so discrepant to the whole character of the record, that it greatly troubles the honest inquirer. But the symbolical theory allows us to understand the account literally; at least, as much so as many prophecies. That is, we may take the terms in a literal sense until science shows us that they are insufficient, and then we are allowed to expand them as far as is necessary. It may be doubtful whether Moses had any idea beyond the literal sense, just as was probably sometimes the case with the prophets. Yet subsequent discoveries make a wide expansion of the term *day* quite natural. Moreover, by regarding the account as a literal one, and the days natural ones, the sanction of the Sabbath is preserved in all its force to those unacquainted with geology, and retained symbolically to those acquainted with it.

"(2.) *This theory gives the amplest scope to the demands of geological science.*

"If the literal day in the Mosaic account may symbolize one ten years long, it may one which is ten millions of years in length. Here, then, is a field wide enough for the amplest demands of geology; nor are we required to give the successive days the same length. So that we can find room for all the widely-different floras and faunas of the geological periods, with intervening revolutions.

"(3.) *This theory does not require us to force Moses into the strait-jacket of modern science;* that is, to represent him as describing animals and plants according to modern scientific arrangements; cryptogamian plants, for instance, instead of "grass;" great reptiles instead of "great whales;" instead of creeping things, the "rapidly-multiplying creature;" instead of waters above and beneath the firmament, "nebulous vapors;" in short, to maintain, as one able writer has done, "that if one should seek to give a sketch in the fewest words of the Celestial Mechanism of La Place, the Cosmos of Humboldt, and the geology of the latest and best authorities, he would do it in the very language of Moses." The grand objection to such opinions is, that if Moses used scientific language in these cases, he must have done it every where, and so must the whole Bible. But we know that in general its language is that of common life, often loose and indefinite in meaning, describing things as they appear, often, and not as they are in their true nature. In the times of Moses, language must have been very general and indefinite, and the views for which we contend require only that in speaking of the different classes of objects created, he gives merely the common, unscientific ideas, which then prevailed, concerning them. It is a great relief thus to be able to extricate the sacred writer from the trammels of modern systems.

"(4) *It is far more natural to suppose the Mosaic life-pictures to be retrospective than prospective.* Suppose we wish to bring into three panoramic groups, as Hugh Miller and others have done, all the existing and fossil species. What is the most natural starting point? In other words, shall we place the fossil or the living species in the first part of the picture, leaving the others to come upon the back-ground as congeneric races? Look at the outline, which I have given a few pages back, of these three life-pictures, as they presented themselves to the eye of Moses, supposing his vision to reach downwards among the fossil species. Directly before him and around him he saw a living, moving fauna and flora more perfect than any which had gone before. Would it not be most natural to take these as the conspicuous figures, leaving the buried races to come in upon the back-ground? Or, even if the historian knew nothing of the existence of the fossil races, so linked are they to the living ones, that they might have been placed on the picture unperceived, to be discovered only by the keen eye of modern science, just as upon a photograph a magnifying glass brings to light many objects before unnoticed. How much more natural, I say, is all this, than to suppose the historian to have passed by the living species, and to have chosen his representatives of creation among some of the inferior developments of the fossil races! From such a stand-point he would be compelled, in order to bring the complete series upon the picture, to look both backwards and forwards, since, in nearly all cases, a few representatives of the different races have preceded their greatest development.

"(6.) *This theory relieves us from the most embarrassing geological objections which lie against other modes of interpreting the demiurgic days.*

"It does not, as they do, exclude the existing organic races, and thus compel us to admit that Moses describes only the fossil species. It does not compel us to place the creation of plants before the sun.

"But the most formidable geological objection to any view which expands the demiurgic days into long periods, is the statement in the second chapter of Genesis, which, as usually understood, teaches that it had not rained on the earth till the third day — a statement not very improbable if the days were of twenty-four hours, but incredible if they were each tens of thousands of years.

"A somewhat careful examination of this passage — more, however, by comparing its different parts with one another, and with other texts of Genesis, than by verbal criticism — has led me to the conclusion, that in several important respects it has been misunderstood. I do not believe that it was intended to give us dates at all, but only to show how God provided for the growth and cultivation of plants when he made them, whatever that time was. One thing essential was the production of rain; and, accordingly, Moses tells us how it was produced, *viz.*, by evaporation from the earth, which afterwards watered the ground; that is, doubtless, as the same process is now often repeated, by the condensation and descent of rain. Commen-

tators have fancied that they saw in this statement a different mode of watering the earth from what now prevails. But the vapor ascended, apparently, just as it now does; and though we are not told how it descended, yet we know how that it is done now, and why should we seek any other mode?

"Thus one of the wants of the new vegetation was supplied: the other was a cultivator, and man was created for that service.

"But must not the period of the ascent of the vapor have been the third day, since, according to the first chapter, that was the time of the introduction of plants?

"It may have been so; but some considerations make it probable that the sacred writer had no reference whatever to dates in his account.

"First, the accounts of the creation in the first and second chapters are so different, that I doubt whether we can safely refer from one to the other for dates. Thus, in the first chapter creation occupies six days, but in the second only one; and this condensation of the work may be intended to prevent all chronological comparisons.

"Again, though the panorama of creation shows plants upon the third picture, yet we have shown that they must have been created at many different and widely-separated epochs. Which of these are referred to in this case, we may not know. Why may it not have been the last, that is, the plants of Eden? Indeed they are so coupled with man as their cultivator, that it must have been the living plants that are here meant. There is nothing in the context, as I can see, that forbids such a supposition.

"I would add, moreover, that so coupled together in the account are man and these newly-created plants, that, if the latter must be referred to the third day of the first chapter, so must the creation of man — an additional fact, showing that, whatever else this passage was intended to teach, it was not chronological dates.

"If this position be admitted, then the geological objection with which we started loses its force, because founded on a wrong interpretation. Hebrew scholars may contest my positions. I submit them with all deference to their candor."

13. Geology and the Bible agree in representing physical evil as in the world before man. Geology shows that the same mixed system of suffering and enjoyment, of liability to painful accident and inevitable death, has always prevailed, as they now do. The Bible, too, intimates that death and other evils preceded man. Of what use were the threatening of death, if no example of it existed among animals? Again, plants were created with seeds in them, and animals

made male and female, for the production of a succession of races, and such a system implies a correspondent system of death. The human family might have been specially preserved by the fruit of the tree of life, perhaps, from the common lot, till they had sinned, when they, too, must die. Again, the selection and fitting up of a spot eastward as the Garden of Eden as a place for man while holy, and his expulsion from it after he had sinned, implies that the world, generally, was, as now, a world of evil and suffering. It was made so from the beginning, because it would ultimately become a world of sin; and sin and death are inseparable.

14. Zoölogy and Geology throw doubt over the literal universality of the deluge of Noah. The many vertical movements of continents, taught by geology, afford a presumption in favor of the Noachian deluge. But the science also shows the absurdity of a wide-spread opinion, that the numerous marine shells and plants found fossil in the rocks were deposited by the deluge. For they extend through more than ten miles thickness of rocks, and are arranged in systematic order, and most of them have been changed into stone by a slow process, and to impute all this to a transient deluge of less than a year's duration, is to impute events to a totally inadequate cause.

The doubts about the flood's universality result, first, from the difficulty of covering the whole earth for so long a time with water: secondly, to find a place in an ark 450 feet long, 75 feet broad, and 45 feet high, for 1,658 species of quadrupeds, 6,000 species of birds, 642 species of reptiles and tortoises, and 120,000 species of insects; all of which have been shown by naturalists to exist. But the grand difficulty is, to collect them all in one spot, and then to disperse them again without a miracle; and if a miracle be introduced, all reasoning is nonsense. Moreover, if the regions inhabited by man, then probably quite limited, were covered, what was the use of drowning the rest of the world? The language of scripture, though at first view seeming strongly to teach a

literal universality, is, in many other cases, quite as strong, although we know that it does not imply universality; but is an example where universal terms are employed to designate only a great many. See Genesis 41: 57. Exodus 9: 25. 10: 15. Acts 2: 5. Colossians 1: 23, etc.

15. The Bible teaches that the earth will be, and geology that it may be, destroyed by fire, and its surface renovated. The Bible declares that the earth will be burnt up, and its elements melted, which would reduce it to a molten globe. Geology shows that the earth contains within itself all the elements necessary to bring about such a result. At the rate the internal heat increases, melted matter would be reached in less than one hundred miles. The proportion of the cooled to the melted matter, may be represented as the circumference of a circle twelve inches in diameter — the line being nine hundredths of an inch wide. It is clear, then, that if from any cause, natural or supernatural, such a crust in one part should be broken through and sink into the molten ocean below, all the rest might flounder and disappear, and a melted globe alone remain. Then would begin anew the formation of another crust, on which another economy of life might be established, and where might be the new heavens and new earth described in the scriptures, as the future residence of man glorified.

III. *Arguments for the Divine Benevolence.* Geology furnishes some new and peculiar arguments in proof of the general benevolence of the Deity. They are called *peculiar*, because some of them have been said to prove former penal inflictions upon the human race. We shall certainly hail with satisfaction any additional light upon this most fundamental doctrine.

Most of the geological proofs of this truth are derived from agencies whose immediate effects are destructive, and thus *prima facie* evidence of malevolence. Thus the soils, so essential to the existence of man, cannot be prepared and spread over the surface of the underlying rocks, without scenes of great desolation. Glaciers and icebergs have covered the country, crushing and tearing up the ledges;

and, subsequently, storms and inundations have prevailed, which, though involving men and animals in destruction, have developed additional capacities in the soil to sustain vegetable and, consequently, animal life. So the processes by which the various useful ores have been injected into the crevices of the rocks, so as to be accessible to man, have been carried through only by violent fractures and upheavings of the strata, and the fusion of some of the veins. How little like benevolence did it appear in the early history of the globe, when the ploughshare of ruin was driven through the earth's crust, its strata were bent, fractured, and dislocated; ridged up into mountains and sunk into valleys. Yet without this apparently ruinous process, man could never have got access but to a small part of the useful mineral materials of the earth; water would have become stagnant over a marshy surface, and the most beautiful scenery of the earth, the mountains and hills, so exquisitely related to each other, would never have existed. In other words, the natural evils were the means of producing natural good. Even the most fearful calamities to which we are subject have marks of benevolence in them — the phenomena of earthquakes and eruptions from volcanoes. They appear to be essential to the preservation of the balance of nature, and give vent to that great furnace of fire within the globe, which might otherwise rend its crust to atoms; and to save countless millions, how small the sacrifice of a few thousand lives! — an incidental effect, but not the object of volcanoes.

Of course the inquiry arises here, as elsewhere, why a Being of infinite perfections could not have secured the good without the evil. The author suggests that the most satisfactory reason for this mixed system, is the fact of the fallen condition of man; man's highest good demands a mixture of evil in the system, as a means of discipline.

Geology furnishes interesting proofs of what the author calls *prospective benevolence*. It is illustrated by the origin and distribution of coal and gold. Untold ages before the creation of man, processes for the formation of coal were in

operation, then, apparently, without design, but intended to provide for the wants of the future man. We might transport ourselves in imagination, and view the gigantic forests in those low lands, as of the United States, where mountain ridges may now rear their summits. We should see them submerged, or forming beds like peat, and interstratified with layers of sand, gravel, and limestone. We might wonder at the immense wastes, at the immense forests, inhabited by few animals of any kind, as the atmosphere is thoroughly impregnated with carbonic acid. But the forests passed away, the strata of alternate beds of vegetable matter and earthy materials, are elevated above the waters; erosion lays bare the edges, and man is introduced; and, after several thousand years, he discovers the use of this coal so long laid up for his benefit. The vast amount of the coal in this country is another significant fact. Not less than two hundred and twenty-five thousand square miles of our surface, equal to twenty-five such States as Massachusetts, are underlaid by beds of coal; and if the average thickness of these beds be only twelve feet, the whole amount of coal in our country cannot be less than five hundred cubic miles; and one cubic mile, at the rate we now use it, would last a thousand years; so that we may estimate the period when our coal will be exhausted at several hundred thousand years, unless its consumption should vastly increase. Not only do we see a striking proof of prospective benevolence, in thus providing for the means of comfort and civilization of future inhabitants, but also in the immense magnitude of this treasure, we may discern the intention of God as to the future population of our country, and the prominent part it is to take in the civilization and salvation of the world.

The illustration from the time and manner in which gold has been introduced into its present position, is even more peculiarly a mark of prospective benevolence, to the geologist's mind. Gold is found, either in veins in the older rocks, or in the sands and gravels of the most recent deposits derived from them, while it is scarcely found at all in the

Mesozoic and Tertiary, or the intermediate formations. Yet both the latest and the intermediate strata, are made of fragments derived from the older rocks. Why, then, should gold be absent from the intermediate series? The conclusion is irresistible, that it was not introduced into the older rocks until after the formation of the intermediate groups. Then the auriferous veins were introduced into the older rocks, so that, as they were denuded subsequently to the Tertiary, the gold was also worn away, and accumulated in the placers. In other words, this accumulation took place just before the introduction of man, as if it was intended solely for him. Of what use could gold have been to the iguanodons, otozoums, or gigantic birds of the intermediate periods? they could use it neither for food, nor as a procurer of food; and they had no higher use for any article. But man uses it for important purposes of political and social economy.

IV. *Miraculous and Special Providence.* — The following is Dr. Hitchcock's definition of Miraculous Providence: "It is a superintendence over the world that interferes, when desirable, with the regular operations of nature, and brings about events, either in opposition to natural laws, or by giving them a less or greater power than usual. In either of these cases, the events cannot be explained by natural laws; they are above, or contrary to, nature, and, therefore, are called miracles, or prodigies."

Geology abounds with such interventions. The facts of all other sciences may be brought into ceaseless cycles, but geology shows a divine hand cutting asunder the chain at intervals, and commencing new series of operations.

We may imagine an observer to stand upon one of the nearest heavenly bodies, as the moon, and see the earth passing through its various stages of progress, and noting when a miracle is performed. He may see the world at first a globe of liquid fire; and the problem is, to fill it with forms of organic life. A crust is first formed, and then the observer sees that races of animals are crawling upon it, and

plants flourishing upon its surface. Though he cannot see the Deity as an agent locate these beings upon the earth, he sees that their creation is a miracle, not resolvable by the laws of nature. If the production of organisms, enough to fill the world, is not a miracle, there is no act that can be, and we might dismiss the term from the language.

But this observer soon discovers new forms of life among the primitive races, and by inspection discovers that the first set of beings have entirely disappeared, and that a fresher and more vigorous economy is introduced. Catastrophes may have destroyed the first, or else the changed condition of the climate, as the planet cooled. Again do the long ages roll on, and Earth rejoices in her crowded and happy population; but the divine decree, which limits the terms of economies, as well as of individual life, must be accomplished; and inundations, earthquakes, eruptions, or slow submergence terminate the second period of life; and then more complex forms are introduced by creation, with such an adaptation to circumstances as only Infinite wisdom can make. In like manner, at least six entire changes of life pass in review, and from twenty-five to thirty successive miraculous acts of creation.

The observer on the moon has witnessed the introduction of separate economies, each one, on the whole, superior to the preceding. He now sees an unusual preparation for the support of higher forms of organization; as a greater extent and richness of soil, a purer atmosphere, and the introduction of the metallic ores. The object of this preparation at length appears; one species so remarkable, that its creation may justly be regarded as the most striking of all the miracles of nature, as it is also of revelation. It is man: a being whose physical organization is the perfected antitype of all other animals; who subjects all others to his sway, and converts even the fiercest elements into servants. Man's creation, as taught by geology, rises up as a lofty monument of miraculous intervention in nature, beating back the waves of unbelief, and reflecting afar the divine wisdom and glory.

Hence we have an important addition to the articles of

Natural Religion; for, heretofore, miraculous intervention has been confined to Revealed Religion. This places miracles upon such a basis that we may confidently appeal to them to take away all improbability from the miracles of Christianity. The constancy and uniformity of nature have been the grand argument against them; and no human testimony, it is said, can prove a miracle in opposition to the will of all nature. Much labor has been spent in the vain attempt to answer this objection of Hume, upon his premises. And, in fact, from metaphysical reasoning, we cannot disprove this objection, without laying down several established fundamental principles, as the existence of a Deity. And, even then, it may be a question whether the reasoning is entirely satisfactory. But the miracles of geology destroy entirely the groundwork of the objection. Miracles are not contrary to experience, for how easy it is to read them from the leaves of nature's volume. We may call the miracles of scripture myths, but it is not so easy to dispose of the thousands of exhumed species of fossils. They testify that miraculous intervention has been a law of God's natural government from the beginning; and if we do not find miracles in the Christian dispensation, it is an exception to the general course of Providence. Thus the *very stones* cry out against unbelief.

Special Providence is also regarded by our author as a doctrine of Natural Religion. "I should define it," says he, "to be an event brought about apparently by natural laws, yet, in fact, the result of a special agency, on the part of the Deity, to meet a particular exigency, either by an original arrangement of natural laws, or by a modification of second causes, out of sight at the time." Thus he regards all special providences as *interpositions* of Deity, inferior in *degree* to miracles. Nor does he confine it, as some do, to phenomena fitted to arrest attention by their peculiar and striking adaptedness to a *moral* design. He also defines a providence as the *event* happening, not the *act* of the Deity in producing the event.

Several special providences in the earth's history are

pointed out. For example, go back to that period in the history of the earth and the moon, when both of them were molten globes. Both have been cooled down so as to become solid. But the moon's surface presents only naked volcanic rocks, and is, therefore, unfit for organic life; while the earth has been going through processes which have fitted it for successive races of higher and higher grades. The agencies of change have been wisely and exactly ordered to produce this difference. To control these operations, especially when the agencies have been at work so irregularly, has needed a guiding hand to meet every exigency.

A special providence is seen in the many careful preparations made for man's benefit. The results of prospective benevolence, in providing the vast stores of mineral fuel, the various metals, the marble and building stones, and the wonderful varieties of natural scenery, are all special providences; for a special fiat was necessary thus to segregate these articles for this particular purpose.

A still more marked example of special providence is seen in the structure of the different races of animals and plants. So far as is known, these changes were all made to adapt organic races to the altered circumstances of the land, the waters, and the air. This shows that the Creator, after once arranging the laws of nature wisely, did not leave them to run on interminably, but stood by the great machine, and modified its action as was best. He so shaped and modified the moving forces, as to meet the exigencies of living beings.

The importance of this doctrine to religion need not be dwelt upon here. It is surely an unexpected encouragement to us to persevere in prayer; for it teaches us that all events are guided by the hand of the Deity, not by blind law, and that, when necessary, either to answer some humble prayer, or accomplish some desirable purpose, he will alter the usual course of nature by second causes, out of sight, so as to bring about the special result.[1]

---

[1] This subject is fully discussed by Prof. H. in the Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. XI. pp. 776—800.

V. Another important position of the author is that in connection with human history, *Geology presents strong pre-Adamic as well as post-Adamic evidence of the fallen condition of this world, and presumptive proof of the mediatorial work of Christ.*

Geology shows that the same organic and inorganic laws which now prevail, have been in operation on the globe from the earliest times, and, consequently, the same mixed system of enjoyment and suffering among animals. Accidents now may happen to all, and death is inevitable. So was it with the earliest trilobites and brachiopods of the Silurian age. Their numberless petrified relics show how unsparing death has been. Hence the idea which some have expressed, that suffering and death were introduced among the lower animals, only after the sin of our first parents, is erroneous.

The mixed system of good and evil under which we live, seems to be adapted for a state of probation for man. The evils are adapted to discipline the moral powers by trying their strength. But why has this mixed system prevailed from the dawn of earthly organic existence? Why should the inferior animals be made to suffer long before man's existence, because he would, by transgression, incur the divine displeasure? If God foresaw that man would sin, and that a probationary system was the best for sinners, infinite benevolence would adapt the world for a fallen being; and if it can be shown that animal existence is, upon the whole, a blessing, or if animals may exist in another world, and there receive some compensation, we can see why God, to give unity to the system, should from the first have mixed evil with good in the natural world. Thus, moreover, would he more impressively exhibit the evil of sin.

By comparing revelation and science, the conviction will be impressed upon us, that all the disorders and sufferings of the present world, and in its past history, point significantly to the cross. That solves the deepest mysteries of all time, before or after Adam. A world fallen yet redeemed, is the great truth engraved upon the earliest and deepest

foundations of the earth by her Creator and Redeemer. This is the profoundest lesson of paleontology.[1]

VI. *Geology Presents us with New and Enlarged Views of the Divine Plans.* The plans of God have been developed gradually. The Mosaic dispensation was a revelation of plans not known to the patriarchs: the Christian dispensation is much in advance of the Mosaic, and modern science is permitted to extend the knowledge of the Christian in respect to God's works and laws in every direction. The telescope has opened an infinity in one direction and the microscope in another. Geology leads us into depths of duration alike beyond the imagination.

One of these plans is the *law of unity.* Unity of design is a striking characteristic of existing nature. Though there are diversities of form, aspect, and structure, yet we everywhere meet with the same original model on which all are constructed, — the organic and inorganic, the great and the small, the proximate and the remote, bound together by ten thousand relations and sympathies into one golden tissue of harmonies. This same thread of unity runs through all the successive economies of life that have successively appeared upon the earth. They were not several independent systems, but they form the parts of one great whole. For the laws of inorganic matter have never varied, nor have the laws of organisms, or the laws of zoölogy, botany, anatomy, and physiology. For the fossil animals and plants can be classified with existing species; and not only so, but certain links that are wanting between existing forms, are supplied from the fossil races. For example, in existing nature, there is a sudden transition between birds and reptiles: there are no animals having a type of structure intermediate between these two classes. But geology presents us with examples of beings forming this connecting link, among the *Lithichnozoa*, or the animals who made

[1] The author has developed this subject in a lecture entitled: *The Cross in Nature and Nature in the Cross*, which will appear in a subsequent number of the Bibliotheca Sacra.

the tracks upon stone. One class of them have ornithic and lacertilian features combined.

Another important principle is the *law of change*. The law of constancy and uniformity in nature is subordinate to the higher law of change. Hitherto, the law of gravitation has generally been considered the highest of all laws, second only to the divine will, but our modern sciences show it to be subordinate to the law of change.

In the inorganic world change is the great conservative principle of the universe. If only mechanical forces operate, matter would be condensed into lifeless adamant. But chemical changes give mobility to the particles, and the segregating processes of affinity and cohesion begin the mighty cycle of change, which would be endless were the forces, as in gravity, exactly balanced. But they are not, and hence a particular system fails — requiring divine power to interpose and commence a new series. Thus the law of change is a higher power, coming in to modify and control for a time, the law of constancy. And herein is its special adaptation to our world; for it the endless variety needed by sentient creatures, and allows a permanency as enduring as Infinite Wisdom sees fit to ordain.

Change shows itself in the organic world by the introduction of modified forms of organization. It is seen as we examine in review the constituents of the different systems of life. Different families, genera, and species lie close together, and of such varied proportions, that we almost fancy them to belong to some other system. But we learn presently that they are only wise adaptations to a changing world, possessing strong links of connection with all other terrestrial beings.

When we thus regard these changes, not merely as connected with death, but as the precursors of renovated excellencies, and see that they are but a part of the wise plans of the Deity, we no longer view them as defects in nature, but essential features of a fallen world. We admire the perfect wisdom that has devised them, and anticipate joyfully the wonderful developments of this law yet to appear in eternity.

This topic has an important bearing upon revealed religion; for it removes objections to a miraculous dispensation, and narrows the distinction between natural and revealed religion, giving to both the same origin.

Many interesting suggestions are given in the lecture upon the *vastness of the divine plans.* The mind is almost overwhelmed in considering the infinite spaces developed by astronomy, and the mighty duration of the earth as made known by geology. Chronology has no measuring line long enough to stretch over them, and imagination tires on her wing in attempting the daring flight. Yet to the mind of Jehovah they are perfectly distinct. We discover everywhere, in every change, his footsteps, his energizing and controlling power. Every new *tableau* in the opening series, gives a brighter display, till the harmonies become complete in man.

From the past we may derive a presumption as to the future. If in all past periods change has been the higher and controlling law of our world — the essential means of its preservation and of the happiness of sentient beings — we may presume that other changes are to succeed. And since we know of no example of the annihilation of a single particle of matter, but only of its metamorphosis, we can set no limits to the expanding series. Why may not change, through all eternity, be, as it has been and is now, an essential means of happiness to created natures?

Thus we stand upon the middle point of existence, as it were, and can look backwards and forwards, but cannot pierce to the beginning or end of the series. The extremities lie too deeply buried in the past and the future, to be seen by mortal vision. These views are ennobling. What Christian will hesitate to give up his soul to the liberalizing, purifying, and elevating influences of these grand disclosures? For having felt their interest and power on earth, he may surely hope that their deeper and more thorough study will form a part of the employments and enjoyments of heaven.

We close with the following inference from the whole subject, in the words of the author:

"From all that has been advanced we may safely say, that no other science, nay, perhaps not all the other sciences, touch religion at so many points as geology. And at what connecting point do we discover co lision? If upon a few of them some obscurity still rests, yet with nearly all how clear the harmony — how strong the mutual corroboration! With how much stronger faith do we cling to the Bible when we find so many of its principles thus corroborated! From many a science has the supposed viper come forth and fastened itself upon the hand of Christianity. But instead of falling down dead, as an unbelieving world expected, how calmly have they seen her shake off the beast and feel no harm! Surely it is time that unbelievers, like the ancient heathen, should confess the divinity of the Bible, when they see how invulnerable it is to every assault. Surely it is time for the believer to cease fearing that any deadly influence will emanate from geology and fasten itself upon his faith, and learn to look upon this science only as an auxiliary and friend."

ARTICLE II.

THE ABORIGINES OF INDIA.

Herodotus was the first to introduce India to the acquaintance of the western world. Following the report of Scylax, who at the instance of Darius had explored the river Indus, he enumerates at least four classes of men who had their abode about the mouth of that river.

1. Fishermen, who inhabited the marshes of the Indus, the description of whose habits and methods of fishing would apply, with equal accuracy, to the fishermen of Scinde to-day. 2. Pastoral tribes, called Padaeans. 3. People who ate no flesh, but lived upon vegetable diet, whom no one can fail to recognize. 4. Calatians. These classes he speaks of

in general, as having straight black hair, as "alike black and resembling the Egyptians."[1]

This diversity among the inhabitants of India, thus vaguely alluded to by Scylax the Persian, and which has been noticed and more definitely stated by all travellers, from the time of Scylax and of Alexander to the present, finds its only historical solution in the sacred writings of the Hindus themselves. The authors of the earliest writings — the Vedic Hymns — who style themselves "Aryas" (honorable ones), and who constitute one of the oldest members of the great Arian or Indo-European family, did not, as is well known, probably originate in India. Having a birth-place, as we suppose, somewhere in the highlands of Asia, that "hive of all nations," they early left their ancestral seat to seek adventure or a less contracted dwelling-place in the wide world about them. They were a bold, spirited, and freedom-loving race. Others of their family had gone, before them, to the north and west; they turned to the south; and, crossing the snowy barriers of the Himalaya or Hindu Kush, gradually poured down along the many streams which find their origin among those lofty hills, until they found a more inviting resting-place in the sunny plains of the Panjab — the country of the five rivers.

If, however, we read aright their ancient hymns, offered either in praise of the gods, or as supplications to them, and which lucidly reflect the passing life, the varying feeling of these children of nature, they did not find these spacious tracts which opened so invitingly before them, wholly unpeopled.

We read in these hymns, of Dasyus, of Asuras, of Rakshas, of Flesh-eaters, etc.; all, terms evidently designating enemies to these new comers, who everywhere opposed their progress. And they indicate, usually at least, enemies from without their own ranks, and of different stock, as seen from their differences of speech, color, and faith; while the same opprobrious epithets are occasionally applied to Aryans, who

[1] Thalia, 98—102.

have apostatized from their original belief, or have become political foes. Of these different classes, the Dasyus are the most frequently named. The term "dasyu" meant, originally, "thief," "robber," and afterwards was applied to any enemy, although limited, ordinarily, to tribal or national foes. Their method of allusion to these Dasyus will be seen from the following extracts from the *Rig Veda*, Wilson's translation.

"Discriminate, O Indra, between the Aryas and those who are Dasyus: restraining those who perform no religious rites, compel them to submit to the performance of sacrifices."

"Indra, having attacked the Dasyus and the Simyus, slew them with his thunderbolts; the thunderer then divided the fields with his white-complexioned friends."

"Indra defends his Arya worshipper in all conflicts: in conflicts that confer heaven; he punished for man the neglecter of religious rites: he tore off the black skin."[1]

"Indra has scattered the black-sprung servile hosts."

The diversity in religious faith and physical appearance, between the two classes is, in the above verses, clearly depicted. These Dasyus, moreover, were no despicable foes: they were numerous, and their civilization was not, apparently, very much behind that of the Arian invaders. This is seen in the following hymns:

"O Indra, overthrow, on the part of the Arya, all the servile races, everywhere abiding."

"He put to sleep, by delusion, with his destructive [weapons] thirty thousand of the servile [races]."

"Armed with the thunderbolt, and confident in his strength, he has gone on destroying the cities of the Dasyus"—"their hostile and undivine cities"—"their iron cities"—"a hundred stone-built cities."[2]

One curious hymn exists, which has been thus rendered by Wilson:[3]

"With the thunderbolt thou hast confounded the *voiceless*

[1] Rig Veda, Vol. I. pp. 137, 259. Vol. II. pp. 35, 258.
[2] Ibid. Vol. I. p. 266; Vol. II. p. 258; Vol. III. p. 180.
[3] Ibid. Vol. III. p. 276.

Dasyus, thou hast destroyed, in battle, the speech-bereft foes."

Thus rendered, "voiceless" would undoubtedly refer to the uncouth and apparently inarticulate speech of the barbarians. Max Müller, however, would read, instead of "*an-asas*" (*voice*-less), "*a-nasas*" (*nose*-less), and make it refer to the flat noses of these Dasyus, which would find a counterpart in many of the wild Indian tribes of this day.[1] Wilson, however, condemns Müller's reading.

We find a few hymns, also, which indicate, as we have said, that some foes were of the Aryan household:

"Indra destroyed enemies, both Dasa and Arya enemies."

For hymns against Flesh-eaters, we take two verses from Müller:

"May he burn and hiss like an oblation in the fire! Put your everlasting hatred upon the villain who hates the Brahman, who eats flesh, and whose look is abominable."

"Indra and Soma, hurl the evil doer into the pit, into unfathomed darkness! May your strength be full of wrath to hold out, that no one may come out again."[2]

In the *Brahmanas*, later commentaries upon the *Veda*, and which represent the succeeding stage of Arian immigration, we find, according to Müller,[3] still more distinct allusions to races of men separate from the Arian stock, who are mentioned under the name of *Nishadas*, and as having their abode at one time in the forest, at another in villages of their own.

Passing from the Vedic age to that of *Manu* and the *Epic Poems*, allusions to various wild tribes are still more frequently met with; but allusions no less obscure, and often self-contradictory.

Valmiki, in his great epic, the *Ramayana*, has sung the victory of Rama, the incarnate Vishnu, over the foul fiend Ravana, whose dwelling was in Ceylon, and to rid whom from the earth, Vishnu, at the instance of Brahma, had descended to this lower world. According to the majority of modern critcs, the poet intends by this great song, in which

[1] Bunsen, Phil. of Hist. Vol. I. p. 346.

[2] Müller in Bunsen, Vol. I. p. 345.

[3] Ibid. p. 346.

apes, bears, and vultures play so conspicuous a part, as the allies and guides of Rama, to symbolize the subjection of some southern people to northern conquerors; or perhaps the conquest of Ceylon by the tribes of the continent; and, by apes and bears, it is conceived, are intended the uncouth, uncivilized denizens of the Dekhan. However much of historic truth may lie concealed beneath this strange conceit (and we see that Barthelemy St. Hilaire — whose essays on Buddhism and Hindu philosophy have placed him in one of the first ranks of Oriental scholars — wholly discards the theory[1]), mention is certainly made, throughout the epic, of various scattered classes of barbarians.

And so again in the *Mahabharata*, which is not so much a single epic as a collection of ancient legends incorporated into one work, "Dasyus" are referred to as comprising a number of frontier tribes; while in one passage it is implied that "the Brahmans of that age regarded the Dasyus as owing allegiance to Brahmanical institutions."[2]

Manu also, in his chapter on "mixed classes," dwells at length upon the different tribes existing in his day, all of whom he regarded in common with some earlier writers, as having been, originally, of one of the four castes. Thus he says:

"Three castes, the Brahman, the Kshatriya, and the Vaisya, are twice born; the fourth, the Sudra, is once born; and there is no fifth."[3]

Accordingly he treats all classes not falling, in his time, within the pale of the four castes, as either mixed classes, arising from intermarriage between different castes, or degraded offspring of one of the three "twice-born." Thus he enumerates twelve classes who were once Kshatriyas, but who "have gradually sunk to the state of Sudras, from the extinction of sacred rites, and from having no communication with Brahmans." And so in the following verse:

"Those tribes which are outside of the classes produced from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet, whether they speak

[1] Jour. des Savants, July 1859. [2] Muir's Orig. Sanskrit Texts, p. 179.
[3] Manu, X. 4.

the language of the Mlechhas (barbarians) or of the Aryas, are called *Dasyus*." [1]

By tribes that are "outside," he probably intended such as had voluntarily lost caste by neglect of the religious rites of the Brahmans. While it would be allotting too great an antiquity to Brahmanical institutions to admit the truth of Manu's theory of their origin, we see that he at least recognized the existence of classes of men called Dasyus, which name had been employed to represent those who were of un-Arian extraction, by the earliest writers.

We have hitherto found but slight reference to the physical appearance of these rude people. In the *Puranas*, however, which, though representing the latest period of Hindu literature, unquestionably contain many fragments of ancient history, we do find such reference, while in some, and probably later passages, lists of tribes are furnished, corresponding quite nearly to the names of tribes now existing. In the legend of *Vena*, a prince whose name occurs even in various hymns of the *Rig Veda*, and whose story, found in the *Mahabharata*, is repeated in several *Puranas*, is a passage which is worth our notice. We give it as found in the *Vishnu Purana*, though adopting the version of Muir : [2]

"Vena was a proud prince, who on his exaltation to the throne ventured to give out the proclamation: 'Men must not sacrifice, or offer oblations, or give gifts. Who else but myself is the enjoyer of sacrifices? I am always the lord of oblations.'"

On account of this impious declaration, which he persisted in, in spite of the expostulations of the jealous priests, he was slain by them in their anger, "with blades of sacrificial grass purified by hymns." After his death, the kingdom was infested by robbers, as, Vena dying childless, no king could be appointed. In their despair, the wise men at last thought of an expedient: they rubbed the thigh of Vena to produce a son. The legend then says :

"From his thigh, when rubbed, there sprang a man like

[1] Manu, X. 43—45.

[2] Wilson's Vishnu Purana, p. 98.

a charred log, with flattened face, and very short. 'What shall I do?' said the man, in distress, to the Brahmans. They said to him, 'sit down' (nishida); and he became, in consequence, a Nishada. There sprang, afterwards, from this man, Nishadas, dwelling in the Vindhya mountains, notorious for their wicked deeds. By this means, the sin of the king was expelled; the Nishadas were thus produced, originating in the sin of Vena." By rubbing his right hand, a holy king was then born.

Wilson, in a note to this passage, adds:

"The *Matsya Purana* says there were born outcasts or barbarous races, Mlechhas, black as collyrium. The *Bhagavata Purana* describes an individual of dwarfish stature, with short arms and legs, of a complexion as black as a crow, with a projecting chin, broad flat nose, red eyes, and tawny hair; whose descendants were mountaineers and foresters. The *Padma Purana* has a similar description, adding to the dwarfish stature and black complexion, a wide mouth, large ears, and a protuberant belly." Whether this is an exaggerated description of these wild tribes, we may see in the sequel.

The process by which the Aryans gained control over India, was clearly a slow one. The tide of immigration was evidently affected by the physical characteristics of the country traversed. Supposing that they entered India by the north-west, they must first have encountered the Indus. And so in their earliest hymns, that river is referred to as the boundary of their location. Following the course of that stream, which they probably did only at an early date, they appear again to have turned upon their track, avoiding the broad table-land of Mewar, and filing around to the north and east, until they came upon the Ganges and its tributaries. Here they halted; and here, again, we find the two rivers, Sarasvati and Drishadvati, by a double inversion "the Caggar and Sursooti of our barbarous maps," given as the sacred limit. Manu calls the country between these two rivers, "*Brahmavarta*, because frequented by gods;"[1] refer-

[1] II. 17.

ring, probably, to its sacredness, as the ancient seat of his fathers.

When again resuming their journey, they followed the general course of the Ganges to the south-east. Their habitat, in Manu's day, is given by him when he includes the whole region between the Himalaya and Vindhya mountains, and the two seas, as "*Ariavarta*, or inhabited by respectable men;" and all outside of that as "the land of the *Mlechhas*, or those that speak barbarously." [1]

At his day then, variously estimated at from 900 to 500 B. C., the Aryans had certainly not crossed the Vindhya range. When they did cross, it was only at its eastern and western extremities, keeping almost exclusively to the sea side of the Ghat ranges.

Now by looking over Lassen's map of ancient India, we shall be able to detect at every stage the presence of *nishadas*, or those wild tribes who ever disputed the right of way. What, we now ask, would be the natural consequence of such a meeting of these two races of men, as we find hinted at in their sacred books? We should suppose that the more cultivated and powerful of the two would either exterminate the weaker and less refined, or would incorporate them into their own body, or drive them into regions where they could still maintain their independence. But the extermination of a race so nearly a match for the conquerors, would seem an unlikely occurrence, and particularly so when we consider that these conquerors did not so much court war, as engage in it from the necessity of their position. We have left then the two latter contingencies, and both these have, we conceive, been realized in Indian history.

But further: we find no evidence, either from oral tradition or written legend, of any warlike incursion of the Aryan race upon the peoples south of Hindostan, inhabiting the highlands of the Dekhan. As far as Aryans have settled there in the lapse of centuries, it has been only as peaceful colonists. What then, should we anticipate, would be the possible result of *such* a contact? Should we not, if the natu-

[1] II. 22, 23.

rally inferior race had been forced to succumb to the superior intelligence and energy of the colonists, expect still to find that the weaker race, while acknowledging the rule of the mightier, would present a more unbroken front, in speech, in customs and religious faith, to the aggressions of the conqueror, than had their northern brethren? Such at least, we again conceive, has been the fact in South Indian history.

It is the more especial object of this Essay to bring to view, as far as we may be able, the present political, social, and religious condition of these various tribes, which, by anticipation and for convenience of nomenclature, we may term aboriginal. A faithful sketch of the several religious beliefs which characterize them would be a valuable chapter in the religious history of mankiud. Attention has been but lately called to these tribes, and they yet await a historian. Notices of them which we offer, have been gathered from all sources, mainly from the journals of the several Asiatic societies and the records of travellers.

We present, as an introduction, a brief sketch of the physical geography of India, that we may see at a glance, the natural abode of untamed tribes, and to afford us a thread which we may follow in our survey.

The general peninsula of India is divided into three well marked regions, by the two great mountain ranges which traverse it from East to West. On the north we have the Himalaya range, "the land of snow," stretching, in an almost unbroken line, north-west and south-east, for a distance of eighteen hundred miles, shutting in India from Tibet upon the north. Properly, however, this great chain of mountains which has aided so materially in creating and shaping the mythology of the people, hems in the great peninsula upon the east also; leaving but a single opening into its plains by land. The proper chain of the Himalaya is bounded on the east by the Brahmaputra, and on the west by the Indus; which two rivers, commencing almost literally in an inosculation north of the snowy chain, pass, the one to the east and south, entering the Bay of Bengal by the Ganges which it meets, and the other, to the west and south, into the Persian

Gulf, receiving on its way various tributaries from the Panjab.

The Himalaya range itself constitutes the first great division of India. For it is not a single line of hills, but is formed by a number of parallel ranges, which, occasionally intersected by cross sections, give us the mountain districts of Nepal, Bhotan, etc.

Passing from the Himalayas to the plains below, we meet with no marked elevation until we cross the valley of the Ganges, when we are confronted with another range of hills, less elevated than the Himalayas, but of no little importance in the geography of the peninsula, being the source of numberless tributaries of the Ganges, and forming a natural barrier between the main body of the continent and the peninsula proper. These are the Vindhya mountains. Commencing at Gujerat, they pass, in a north-easterly direction, toward the eastern terminus of the Himalaya. Fortified at their origin by a parallel range of hills, the Satpura mountains, they slope gradually into the basin of the Ganges, leaving comparatively free communication between the plains of Bengal and the southern country.

Hindostan proper, comprising all the region between the Himalaya and Vindhya mountains, is itself divided into two unequal portions by another lesser range of hills, the Aravali, which, commencing at the western terminus of the Vindhya, run almost at right angles to that range, though inclining slightly toward the east, and separate the valley of the Indus from that of the Ganges. Enclosed between the Aravali and Vindhya ranges, is Mewar, the table-land of Hindostan, passing, by gentle descent, into the basin of the Ganges.

The third main division of India is the Dekhan, so called from the Sanskrit "dakshin," or "south" (literally, "right"), comprised between the Vindhya mountains and the southern sea. The Dekhan is not only fortified on the north, it is also flanked, on either side, by the chains of Ghats, which, ranging southerly, unite towards the end of the peninsula. They are so termed from their "ghat" or "step-like" formation, the result of volcanic action. The western Ghats being

much higher than the eastern, there is formed the table-land of the Dekhan, facing toward the Bay of Bengal.

We must again call attention to the admirable fitness of these grand mountain-chains to the necessities of a people whom we have referred to as a race hard-pressed but still unsubdued.

We pass, now, to a consideration of those tribes of India which are clearly distinct from the Aryan or Brahman race, and may still be met with, especially in the elevated regions of that country. We commence at the northern or Himalayan region.

The physical geography of the Himalaya is peculiar. Stretching, as we have seen, from the great bend of the Indus to the great bend of the Brahmaputra, this range is intersected by various streams, which originate in the table-land of Tibet and find an outlet through the Indus, Ganges, or Brahmaputra. The great mountain-peaks, which for altitude stand unrivalled, are not in the main line of the chain, but have, as it were, stepped aside, standing at right-angles to the south of the range, and allowing a passage for the streams from the north, which they also supply with numberless feeders on their way. By these intersections the whole range is divided into three principal districts: First from the Indus comes the Sutlej river, so famous in Anglo-Indian military history, which bounds the Panjab on the east, and forms the main branch of the Indus.

Next in importance, toward the east, is the Kali or Gogra, which, passing south to join the Ganges, shuts in, between itself and the Sutlej, what is known as the districts of Kumaon and Garwhal. Finally, the Tishta separates Nepal from Bhotan on the east with the exception of the little territory of Sikkim, which is pressed in between them.

But, aside from the cross-sections of the chain, there are divisions in the other direction, which give it its marked peculiarity. The mean breadth of the Himalaya is given, by Johnston, as 150 miles; but this must, we think, be erroneous, since Mr. B. H. Hodgson, to whom we are indebted for our first real acquaintance with the configuration of the

range, gives it as only ninety miles; and has been followed, in this, by others.[1]

This breadth of ninety miles he subdivides into three distinct climatic sections, of thirty miles each. In ascending, we come, first, upon a region extending to a height of four thousand feet above the level of the sea. Next follows a section extending from four to ten thousand feet above the sea; and the third reaches from ten thousand feet to about sixteen thousand, the average height of the chain. The two upper regions are simple, admitting of no subdivisions; but not so the lower. This comprises a three-fold tract of country: First, upon entering the hills, you reach a tract called Tarai. This is "an open waste, encumbered, rather than clothed, with grass." It is infested with a direful malaria, arising from its numerous swamps. Immediately above this, is a region of forest, called Bhaver, or Saul Forest. This is as dry as the region below was wet; but not less abounding in malaria. The third division is that of the Dhuns, or sandstone ranges, low hills running parallel with the general chain, and alike noxious in its climate with the two lower divisions. This general outline is true, in detail, only of the central portion of the range; but its traces are evident throughout.

These three grand divisions of the chain, differing in altitude, differ also in the fauna and flora which characterize them. This we should anticipate; but the fact of most interest, and which is hardly so well exemplified elsewhere, is, that what is true here of the lower order of the animal kingdom, is no less true of the highest: these three regions are also the abode of three classes of men, no one of which can venture into the domain of the other two, without serious detriment.

It is these three classes of men that first claim our notice. We begin our survey where the Sutlej pierces the range, in order to avoid commencing with tribes at either extremity, which we might suppose would be affected by contact with

---

[1] Jour. Asiat. Soc. of Bengal, Aug. 1849.

adjoining people, and shall follow along the range, first towards the east, and again westward.

Of the class of people which inhabit the uppermost region of the Himalaya, along its whole extent, we need say nothing, as they are acknowledged to be of pure Tibetan extraction. They are termed Bhotiyas or Bhots. Bhote is, indeed, the proper name of Tibet, and is seen in the name itself — Ti-*bet*. Many of the Bhots of Kumaon trace their descent directly back to Tibet, while their location, immediately upon the southern boundary of that country, their personal appearance, language, religion, customs, and traditions, all unite in confirming their Tatar origin.

But, passing from these regions of snow to the lower divisions of the range, we at once find ourselves in a different ethnological latitude. In the middle division there are two classes of people prevalent, a Hindu and an un-Hindu race. The general distinction between the two is obvious, and yet their commingling has caused a confusion which embarrasses minute inquiry. That the Hindu, by which we intend the Brahminic or Aryan race, should be found here, is not at all surprising. Apart from their natural spread, as seeking new fields for conquest or for trade, religious feeling has sensibly drawn them towards these heights. The Himalaya, as we have mentioned, has ever been a prominent feature in the Hindu myth. Its wild recesses and imposing peaks, which must early have arrested their attention, have always been favorite haunts of the gods and goddesses ; and their lives are full of allusions to the grand features of these mountains. We cannot wonder, then, that they should have assumed a sacredness in the eye of a holy religionist, which should court a closer intimacy. Accordingly we meet here the well-known features, customs, and faith of the dwellers on the plains, and with these, as the superior, the aborigines have frequently sought and gained connection. There are, however, still remaining, a few tribes roaming through the woods in a savage state, which will well represent the original denizens of the mountain valleys.

Such are the *Rawats* or *Rajis*. They dwell in the secluded forests, in the eastern part of the districts; and, although reduced, according to Mr. Traill,[1] to some twenty families, still adhere pertinaciously to the customs of their ancestors. Such also are the *Doms*, now outcasts and hewers of wood and drawers of water for other tribes; but probably a branch lopped off long since from the Rawat stock, degenerate in customs, in character, and in physical type, approximating the Negro in their curly, crisp hair, and black complexion.

The religion of these tribes is, as so generally among the aborigines of India, a purely nature religion. Every remarkable mountain, cave, forest, peak, fountain, and rock has its presiding demon and spirit, which are so reverenced by the people that a luckless geologist brought down upon his head the maledictions of the people, and barely escaped with his life, for having innocently broken off the nose of one of these rock demons, in a scientific ramble. To these spirits frequent sacrifices are offered, and various ceremonies are performed, in small temples often found, and which are frequented to the almost entire neglect of the Hindu temples found in the district.

The presence of temples is a rare occurrence among these rude tribes; and must in this case, we conceive, be attributed to the presence of the influential residents of the plain, whom they may have imitated in this, as they have in other things. That such should be the case, will not appear strange, when we remember that the Brahmans have not disdained to borrow even from their uncivilized neighbors. The well-stocked Hindu Pantheon was no early production; but has grown up almost within the historical era. The known introduction of many portions of this aboriginal faith, and the unquestioned fact that a vast number of the legends, dogmas, and religious rites, now deemed orthodox, never could have arisen by any natural development from the Vedic faith, since inconsistency, in every part of the present religious system, is glaringly present, force us to believe that, in entering India, the Aryan found already domiciled a religious faith having firm

[1] Asiat. Researches, xvi. 137.

hold on the affections or superstitions of the people, and which, as he could not break it up, he incorporated into his own system, with sagacious policy but with sad detriment to the consistency of his own belief. It is for this reason that an analysis of the *current* religious faith has proved, and must ever prove, so perplexing.

But to return to these hill-tribes: a belief in all sorts of ghosts is common among them. Demons, elves, goblins, all come in for a share of their worship. There are ghosts of murdered men, ghosts of children, ghosts of cruel men, and ghosts of bachelors! These last, termed Tolas (our "Will-o'-the-wisp"), are supposed to be contemned by all other classes of ghosts, who shun their society and force them to lead a mournful existence in wild and solitary places. One scarcely finds a village that has not a demon, which often afflicts men, women, children, and cattle. The ghosts of children are in reality mere optical delusions, or shadows, so frequent in mountainous countries. These shadows, so gloomily and silently sweeping along the mountain sides, are to these superstitious savages mysterious personalities, and are worshipped by them under the endlessly changing forms which they present.

But the bulk of the population in these two provinces of Kumaon and Garwhal is made up of *Khasiyas*. There is much conflict of opinion as to whence these people originated. Mr. Hodgson thinks them to be, in common with most of the Himalayan aborigines, of ancient Tibetan extraction, but to have become altered by intimate union with Hindu immigrants; and that being now the dominant race, they have taken special pains to conceal their rude origin.[1] Capt. Strachey however, well known by his geological surveys of the Himalaya, believes them to be of pure Hindu extraction.[2] At present few traces, either lingual or physical, of savage origin appear. They are however of interest, as being the most important of these hill tribes, and as having, almost beyond a doubt, gained mention by Manu and the

[1] Jour. As. Soc. Bengal, Vol. XVII., Part 1, 1848.

[2] Report of Brit. Assoc. 1851. p. 94.

Vishnu Purana, which so far confirms their aboriginal descent.

The *Vishun Purana* classes them among "ferocious and uncivilized races."[1] Manu specifies them as among those Kshatriyas "who have gradually sunk to the state of Sudras from the extinction of sacred rites, and from having no communication with Brahmans."[2]

Passing over the Kali, from Kumaon to Nepal, we come upon several tribes of no special interest, and whose origin is alike doubtful. They are the *Sunwars*, the *Gurungs*, the *Magars*, the *Jareya*, and the *Newar*. Their Tibetan origin is probable, and they are certainly not more than half Hindu in customs and religion.

Along with these, however, are found tribes of peculiar interest, from their entire isolation from all others. They are the *Chepang* and *Kusundu*. We quote Mr. Hodgson:

"Amid the dense forests of the central region of Nepal, to the westward of the great valley, dwell, in scanty numbers and nearly in a state of nature, two broken tribes, having no apparent affinity with the civilized races of that country, and seeming like the fragments of an earlier population. They toil not, neither do they spin; they pay no taxes, acknowledge no allegiances; but, living entirely upon wild fruits and the produce of the chase, are wont to say that the rajah is lord of the cultivated country, as they are of the unredeemed waste. They have bows and arrows, of which the iron arrowheads are procured from their neighbors, but almost no other implement of civilization; and it is in the very skilful snaring of the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, that all their little intelligence is manifested.

"Boughs, torn from trees and laid dexterously together, constitute their only houses, the sites of which they are perpetually shifting, according to the exigencies or fancies of the hour. In short, they are altogether, as near what is usually called the state of nature, as anything in human shape can well be. They are not noxious, but helpless; not vicious,

---

[1] V. P. p. 195. [2] Manu. 10 : 43.

but aimless, both morally and intellectually; so that no one could, without distress, behold their careless, unconscious inaptitude.

"Compared with the mountaineers, among whom they are found, the Chepangs are a slight but not actually deformed race, though their large bellies and thin legs indicate strongly the precarious amount and innutritious quality of their food. In height, they are scarcely below the standard of the tribes around them; who, however, are notoriously short of stature. but in color, they are very decidedly darker, or of a nigrescent brown."

As to their origin, Mr. Hodgson, at first, deemed them to be fragments of an aboriginal population, allied to the "Tamulian" race, by which he intends the general aboriginal class of central and southern India; but, he says, "upon turning to the lingual test, I found that with the southern aborigines there was not a vestige of connection; whilst, to my surprise, I must confess, I discovered in the Lhopas (Tibetans) of Bhutan, the unquestionable origin and stock of the far-removed, and physically very differently-characterized Chepangs."

Leaving the *Murmis* and *Kiratas*, two tribes little known, we meet two others, *Limbus* and *Lepchas*, the latter the more numerous and sketched for us by Dr. Hooker, in his "Himalayan Journals."

The Limbus abound most in East Nepal. "They are Buddhists; and, although not divided into castes, belong to several tribes." Buddhist however by name, they are not necessarily so in practice. Latham, in his "Ethnology of India," gives, from an account of Capt. Sherwill, a glimpse of a Limbu festival. We quote the former:

"All the men, women, and children, amounting to about twenty, were drunk. And they were hospitable. At the house of the principal man of the neighborhood, some thirty men and women were sitting on the ground, drinking hot *chee*. Some beat drums. In the middle a young girl, highly excited, in a fantastic dress fringed with the teeth of beasts, the beaks and spurs of birds, the claws of bears, and

cocks' tail-feathers, was dancing. Her action was slow and monotonous at first; then, livelier and more rapid; then, hurried and irregular; then, frenzied and uncontrollable. The noise, too, increased; the humming or singing became a shout; the drums beat louder and more discordantly. There was a fire in the middle of the circle; the poor girl dashed into it and, with her naked feet sent the burning ashes over the floor. Then a propensity to mischief set in. She would pull down the frames upon which the domestic utensils were hung; she would burn down the house. The next morning she was as quiet and demure as any decent little Limbu could be."[1]

The Lepcha is found most in the little district of Sikkim, between Nepal and Bhotan. He is of marked Mongolian features, and allied also by language to that race. Dr. Hooker gives a very favorable view of him:

"He is timid, peaceful, and no brawler. He is in morals far superior to his Tibet and Bhotan neighbors, polyandry being unknown and polygamy rare. In diet, they are gross feeders; rice, however, forming their chief sustenance. Pork is a staple dish; and they also eat elephant and all kinds of animal food." This in entire contrast to Hindu or Mohammedan custom.

"Marriages are contracted in childhood, and the wife purchased by money, or by services rendered to the future father-in-law.

"The Lepchas profess no religion, though acknowledging the existence of good and bad spirits. To the good they pay no heed. 'Why should we?' they say: 'the good spirits do us no harm; the evil spirits who dwell in every rock, grove, and mountain are constantly at mischief, and to them we must pray, for they hurt us.' Every tribe has a priest-doctor; he neither knows nor attempts to practise the healing art, but is a pure exorcist; all bodily ailments being deemed the operation of devils; who are cast out by prayers and invocations. Still they acknowledge the Lamas to be

[1] Ethnology of India, p. 23.

very holy men, and were the latter only moderately active, they would soon convert all the Lepchas."[1]

In the course of his travels, Dr. Hooker met with an incident which well illustrates their superstitious feelings. He was attended by Lepcha guides and a Lama priest. Proposing to cross a lake, the Lama had provided a little bark boat and some juniper incense. Setting fire to the incense on the bark, he sent the boat far across the lake, whose surface was soon covered with a thick cloud of smoke.

"Taking a rupee from me, the priest then waved his arm aloft, and pretended to throw the money into the water, singing snatches of prayers in Tibetan, and at times shrieking at the top of his voice to the Dryad who claims these woods and waters as his own. There was neither beast, bird, nor insect to be seen, and the scenery was as impressive to me as the effect of the simple service was upon my people, who prayed with redoubled power, and hung more rags upon the bushes.

"This invocation of the gods of the woods and waters, forms no part of Lama worship; but the Lepchas are but half Buddhists: in their hearts they dread the demons of the grove, the lake, the snowy mountain and the torrent, and the crafty Lama takes advantage of this.'

We have thus far confined our inquiries to the central of the three Himalayan regions. Descending now to the lowermost, the region of swamp and forest, we come upon several tribes not so closely allied to the Tatar race as those immediately above them, presenting some affinities to the scattered hill tribes of Hindostan. Three of these races have been made the subject of a valuable monograph by Mr. B. H. Hodgson, to whose discoveries of Buddhist sacred books oriental scholars have been so much indebted.[3]

These are the *Kocch*, *Bodo*, and *Dhimal* tribes, inhabiting a portion of this sub-Himalayan tract upon the borders of Nepal and Bhotan. We shall confine our remarks to the Bodo and Dhimal, who are much like the Kocch, and of

[1] Hooker. Himalayan Journals. Vol. I. Chap. 5. [2] Idem. Vol. I. Chap. 16.
[3] Jour. Asiat. Soc. Bengal. Vol. XVIII., part 2, 1849.

whom we have the fullest account. The Kocch are, however, probably the most numerous, estimated by Hodgson at not less than 800,000 souls. The Bodo he numbers at from 150,000 to 200,000, the Dhimals, who are fast dwindling away, at only 15,000.

The two latter races are wandering cultivators of the wilds, never remaining in one place over six years. "They have no buffaloes, few cows, no sheep, a good many goats, abundance of swine and poultry, some pigeons and ducks." No trade is sought, scarcely any needed. Each one lives upon the produce of his own farm. Each is his own currier, weaver, and barber, or else each for his neighbor. They have no servants nor slaves. "Though they have no idea of a common tie of blood, yet there are no divers clans, septs, or tribes among them, nor yet any castes; so that all Bodo and all Dhimals are equal — absolutely so in right or law — wonderfully so in fact. Nor is this the dead level of abject want. On the contrary, the Bodo and Dhimal are exceedingly well fed, and very comfortably clothed and housed."

Marriage, as we have seen in other tribes, is more a contract than a rite, dissoluble at will of either party, the lover paying for his bride by money, or labor for his future father-in-law. Chastity is marked: no infanticides, human sacrifices, sati, nor bar to re-marriage. They *bury* their dead: after three days of uncleanness, a feast is prepared. "When ready and the friends are assembled, before sitting down they all repair once more to the grave, when the nearest of kin to the deceased, taking an individual's usual portion of food and drink, solemnly presents it to the dead, with these words:

"'Take and eat: heretofore you have eaten and drank with us; you can do so no more: you were one of us; you can be so no longer: we come no more to you; come you not to us.'

"Then they eat, drink, and make merry as though they were never to die." They may and do eat all meats, and drink beer, but never spirits.

The religion is distinguished by the absence of everything

that is shocking, ridiculous, or incommodious. They have no sect of priests, any one may become one who chooses, and no dress nor special favor marks them. They worship the host of heaven and 'the powers that be' on earth. As elsewhere, so here, diseases are deemed to be from devils; the exorcist is the doctor. They appear to have a vague perception of the moral character of the divinities which they worship, as an oath binds them, while we may, perhaps, even trace these various powers to a single source; and yet they are said to have no terms for God, soul, heaven, hell, sin, piety, prayer, or repentance. All the elements are worshipped, but preëminently the rivers, upon which they are so dependent. They have also their household, or national gods, worshipped by each family, and once a year by the whole village, at the dwelling of one member of the tribes, each taking his turn, year by year.

They have no temples nor idols. Though they believe in witchcraft and the evil eye, they discard all ghosts, sorcery, or omens. The rites consist of offerings, sacrifices, and prayers, so that they have the act of prayer if not the name. They invoke protection for man, beast, and crop. They offer fruits and flowers, and sacrifice animals, — sacrifice being deemed of the greatest worth. They have four festivals yearly, the last devoted to the household gods, the other three to the elemental gods and the interests of agriculture.

In his travels in the forest, Mr. Hodgson happened upon a company engaged in one of the latter, called the Bamboo Festival. Thirteen men in a circle held each a bamboo pole. Within the circle were three men. One danced to a song sung. The priest would mutter an incantation, and all would give the chorus. The third in the circle was an attendant who would now and then sprinkle with holy water another, the principal actor, called Deoda, or "possessed." "When we first discerned him," says Mr. H., "he was sitting on the ground, panting and rolling his eyes so significantly that I at once conjectured his function. Shortly after, the rite still proceeding, the Deoda got up, entered the circle and commenced dancing with the rest, but more wildly.

He held a short staff in his hand with which, from time to time, he struck the poles one by one, lowering it as he struck. The chief dancer with an odd-shaped instrument waxed more and more vehement in his dance; the inspired grew more and more maniacal; the music more and more rapid; the incantation more and more solemn and earnest; till at last, amid a general lowering of the heads of the decked bamboos, so that they met and formed a canopy over him, the Deoda went off in an affected fit, and the ceremony closed without any revelation, a circumstance which must be ascribed to the presence of the sceptical strangers."

The manners of these tribes are pleasing; modest, but cheerful. Their character is full of amiable qualities. They are intelligent, docile, frank, honest, and truthful, steady and industrious after their way, but not so good workers when placed in novel or trying positions.

We have now reached the Eastern limit of what Mr. Hodgson would term the Indo-Tartar tribes, formed by the river Dhansri, a tributary of the Brahmaputra. Between the Dhansri and the great bend of the latter river are several tribes, such as the *Daphlas*, *Akas*, *Bors*, *Abors*, *Mishmis*, and *Singphos*, inhabiting the middle region of the Himalaya, but which we merely name, as little known. But among other tribes of Asam are some which are more worthy of detailed notice.

Such are the *Mikirs*, of the district of Nowgong. They number in all about 10,000, dwelling in the plains as well as on the hills. Their dialect differs much from that of surrounding tribes, allied to the Naga, if to any. They worship sun and moon, rivers, large stones and trees, and sacrifice to them hogs, goats, and fowls. They sacrifice also if an epidemic appears: if that avails nothing, they forsake their homes for the dense forest. They have no priests. Marriage is a contract; polygamy unknown. They burn their dead, and bury the ashes.[1]

South of them are the *Kasias*, whose country is noted for its "cromlechs."

[1] Butler. Travels in Assam. Chap. 8.

To the west of the latter are the *Garos* or *Garrows.* They have a surly look, but are of a mild disposition; the women "the ugliest ever beheld." They eat everything — dogs, frogs, snakes, and the blood of all animals. Marriage, as usual among these tribes, is free, but they have one custom, probably more agreeable to some parties than to others: if the parents of the lady do not consent to her marriage, they are beaten by the other party until they do.

The dead are burnt. They are in general pagans in religion, worshipping the elements, and sacrificing animals upon an altar, though by contact with Hindus, paying some homage to Siva.[1]

In the east of Asam are the *Kukis.* There are Old Kukis, and New Kukis. They have one noticeable and peculiar custom — that of smoke-drying the bodies of their deceased chiefs. Their notions on religious matters are vague. They have no images nor temples. When one dies, the soul, if of a good man, is led with a song of triumph to the gods, ever after to live at ease: the sinner is to be impaled or cast into a deep burning gulf, or plunged in boiling water. The Kukis aver that they came from the South.[2]

Better known than most of these tribes are the *Nagas,* an extensive vocabulary of whose language has been furnished us by Mr. Brown, a Baptist missionary.[3] They inhabit the extensive mountain range upon the eastern boundary of Asam, and separating it from the northern parts of Burmah. Mr. Brown says that their language has a close affinity to the Burmese; to the Bhotan; to the Tibetan; and especially that of the Miris and Abors, who inhabit the mountains between Asam and Tibet. The difference between this language and several of the Tatar dialects is scarcely greater than that existing between different dialects of the Nagas themselves.

Major Butler, who spent some time among them, thinks that they have no idea of a future state of rewards and pun-

---

[1] Asiat. Researches, Vol. III. p. 17. [2] Butler. Travels in Assam. Chap. VI.
[3] Jour. Am. Orient. Soc. Vol. II. p. 155.

ishments. They believe, however, in good spirits and bad, and offer them sacrifices of cows, dogs, cocks, and liquor. He specifies a number of strange customs; among others the following: When the body of a deceased man of respectability is buried, the men in war-clothes dance about the grave and say —

"What spirit has come and killed our friend? Where have you fled to? Come, let us see you, how powerful you are. If we could see you, we would spear you and kill you with these spears!" And so with like speeches and with war-whoops they curse the spirits and beat the earth with their spears. If a man falls sick, they offer the spirit the entrails of a fowl. If very sick, the fowl is let loose in the jungle as an offering to the living spirit. Omens are often taken on any special occasion.[1]

We have followed the tribes of the Sub-Himalaya from the Sutlej to the eastern boundary of India: we are ready now to turn upon our steps and follow the Himalaya westward from the same river.

There is nothing, however, which can detain us between the Sutlej and the Indus. The tribes are but little known, and, as far as known, are not different from those inhabiting the like regions to the east of the Sutlej. In religion, the most marked feature is, that as Mohammed rather than Buddha has been felt as master in these western Himalayan regions, so we find the Mussulman element encroaching upon a primitive faith, when in the east we have found Lamaism dominant. We cannot make the Indus the Ethnological boundary of India on the west, any more than we can affirm the Brahmaputra to be the eastern limit. Beyond the Indus are tribes clearly connected with strictly Indian races, both Brahman and aboriginal.

The first of the latter class is the *Kafir* family. They dwell upon the southern slope of the Hindukush, within an extent of territory about two degrees from east to west, and a less distance north and south. Their mere name

[1] Butler. Travels in Assam, Chap. IX.

gives us their history; for "Kafir" is "Infidel" on a Mohammedan's tongue, which name indicates the outside pressure to which they have been subjected, and the fact that they have successfully resisted that pressure. Their inaccessible position has probably served most to secure to them and preserve this title of Kafir, which they themselves use, and the same unsparing warfare between Mussulman and infidel is still waged in these hills. The Mussulman is ever endeavoring to enslave the Kafir: the Kafir constantly imprecates curses from his gods upon the Mussulman.

It was Elphinstone who first brought us notice of this interesting people, and little has been added since his day, save a chapter or two by Burnes.

Their chief god is called by some, Imra, by others, Dagun. "They have also numerous idols, which they say represent great men of former days, who intercede with God in favor of the worshipper. Their idols are of stone or wood, and always represent men and women, sometimes mounted, sometimes on foot." By being specially hospitable when living, any man may at death be deified and worshipped equally with the other gods. Consequently, the gods are not few, and differ in different localities. They know Siva or Mahadeva by name, but all eat beef. Furthermore they sprinkle their idols with blood, and even the blood of cows.

They sacrifice cows and goats to the supreme deity, particularly at a great festival which lasts for ten days, in the beginning of April. Fire also is requisite at every religious ceremony. At a sacrifice to Imra, "a fire was kindled before a stone post, said to be the emblem of Mahadeva: through the fire, flour, butter, and water were thrown upon the stone: at length an animal was sacrificed and the blood thrown through the fire upon the stone: part of the flesh was burned, and part eaten by the assistants, who were numerous and who accompanied the priest in various prayers and devout gesticulations. Though using fire so much, they hold it in no peculiar reverence.

They have hereditary priests, but these have little influence. There are also among them persons who procure

inspiration from superior beings by holding their heads over the smoke of the sacrifice; but these are not specially reverenced.

The husband pays a dowry for his wife. Polygamy is allowed, adultery common.

"They neither burn nor bury their dead, but place the body in a box, arrayed in a fine dress, which consists of goat-skins or Cashgar woollens: they then remove it to the summit of a hill near the village, when it is placed on the ground, but never interred." Every funeral concludes with an entertainment, and an annual feast is given in memory of the deceased, while food is exposed for the manes.

They detest fish, but hold no other animal impure, eating anything, though chiefly cheese, butter, and milk. Although exasperated to fury by the persecutions of Mohammedans, so that no Mohammedan can safely enter their country, yet they are a harmless, affectionate, and kind-hearted people, merry, playful, fond of laughter, and although passionate, easily appeased.[1]

The origin of this strange people is obscure: their language closely connects them with the Arian family; but their religion and social customs, so peculiar; whence come they?

Leaving Kafiristan, and with it all Himalayan regions, we pass southward. Cabûl and Affghanistan are thoroughly Mohammedan: the Hindu element which may exist in the people of these countries it is difficult to eliminate. In Beluchistan, however, is found a class of people called *Brahui*, which call for a passing notice.

Pottinger, in his great work on Beluchistan, speaks of them as clearly distinct from the Biluchis proper. So much do they differ, he says, "that it is impossible to mistake a man of one class for a member of the other. The Brahuis, instead of the tall figure, long visage, and raised features of their fellow countrymen, have short, thick bones, with round faces and flat lineaments:—numbers of them have brown

[1] Elphinstone, Cabûl, Vol. II. App. Burnes, Cabûl, Chap. IX.

hair and beards."[1] They are a hardy race of mountaineers, wandering constantly in search of fresh pasturage for their flocks: more peaceful and industrious than the Biluchis, but courageous and of a noble disposition. In religion, they are Mussulmen.

But it was not their physical appearance which first attracted the attention of scientific men, so much as their language. Lassen's notice was first called to it by a brief published vocabulary. Since him, Latham, and, more recently, Caldwell, have examined it with the same striking result. It has been found, that, while the language as a whole is one with the Biluchi, there are many grammatical forms and a few vocables which ally it at once with dialects of India, and not Northern India or Hindostan, but the Dekhan. A clear statement has been given by Mr. Caldwell, which sets the matter beyond dispute. This fact, so interesting, we shall again call attention to.

It is to the hills, as we have before said, that we must look for remnants of a conquered race. We have found them in the Himalaya: let us now seek them in the parallel range of the Vindhya, and in the coast chains of Ghats. We take our stand first at the western terminus of the Vindhya range, at the point where the Tapti and Nerbudda rivers enter the Persian Gulf.

From the formation of the British factory at Surat, the attention of the merchants was attracted to a class of men who infested the adjoining country and injured their trade. They were called *Bhils*. In 1824, Major Gen. Sir John Malcolm, to whom India is so much indebted, collected what he could learn respecting this people and presented it to the Royal Asiatic Society. It is from this paper, and also from a later one by Captain Hunter, that we mainly derive our information.[2]

The central location of the Bhils is Khandeish, on the southern slope of the Satpura hills. They spread southward

---

[1] Pottinger. Travels in Beloochistan and Sinde, Chap. IV.

[2] Transactions of Roy. Asiat. Soc. Vol. I. p. 65. Jour. R. A. S. 1844, p. 176.

however as far as Pûnah, and are found to the north in the province of Malwa.

The Bhils are divided into two classes: the village or cultivating (who are the watchmen), and the wild or mountain Bhils. They generally, however, preserve the same usages and the same form of religion. The hill tribes have ever been noted for their predatory habits; they not only frequently attack the villages of the plains, but they claim and enforce the right of levying a tax upon all who pass through their territory, and woe to the luckless traveller who resists! Lutfullah, the Mohammedan gentleman, whose curious autobiography has lately been edited by Mr. E. B. Eastwick, gives an interesting account of an enforced residence among these freebooters, and of their savage life and character.[1]

The religion of the Bhils is distinct from Brahmanism, although not unaffected by it. They worship Siva. They worship also the "goddess of small pox," a fact common in South India. They have, however, no temples, except a consecrated spot under some particular tree. They have idols. "They often make small mud figures of horses, which they range around an idol, to whom they promise a fine charger, if he will hear their petition; and it is not unusual to put the image upon one of these figures. In many of their legends the principal event depends on the assistance or advice of an enchanted horse."

"They keep all feasts, Hindu and Mohammedan, with equal zeal; and the most solemn form of oath is that of mixing salt, cowdung and jowaree, and lifting up the mixture. If a Bhil perjures himself by this oath, he is deemed execrable, and abandoned by his caste."

"There is among them a class of priests or 'medicine men' who are supposed, through the influence of the hill gods, to be endowed with the hereditary gift of inspiration. Their powers are, however, dormant until excited by music. Accordingly, musicians who sing the praises of the gods are ever at hand to render assistance." When the recitation of

[1] Autob. Chap. IV.

these songs has kindled the spark of spiritual fire, they begin to dance with frantic gesture, and loosening their hair, toss and whirl it around their heads, whilst their whole frame becomes agitated, as if under the influence of strong convulsions. In this state of phrenzy they give utterance to oracles which are attentively listened to by those who come to consult them. If a novice does not show a soul alive to the charms of music he is at once discharged from candidateship to priesthood.

Marriages are contracted by the parents of the parties. A widow may re-marry. They *bury* their dead. They are excessively fond of liquor, and eat all meats, though the mountain Bhils show signs of poor diet. These Bhils, after all, have a few redeeming traits. They are loyal to their chiefs, never betraying them: they are loyal to their word, oddly so; "if an offender is seized, he not only confesses his fault, but any others he may have committed; and details his adventures with the utmost *sang froid* and innocency, stating the names of his associates, be they friends or near relatives." He boldly avows his trade and stoutly defends himself by the words, "I am Mahadeva's thief."

Evidence that the Bhils once possessed far more than the land they now occupy, is found in the fact that every Rajput prince upon his accession to the throne has been from time immemorial obliged to have his forehead marked with blood from the thumb or toe of a Bhil, indicating a sort of nominal subjection to him.

To the north of the Bhils, upon the Aravali range, are the *Mirs*, of the Mairwara hills. They are like the Bhils in character, habits, and faith: although they have nominally embraced Mohammedanism, and aver that they are of pure Hindu lineage. The presence of Rajputs, who fled from the plains into the mountains at the approach of the Mohammedans accounts for the latter fact.

To the east of the Mirs are the *Minas*, in the districts of Ambir and Jaipur. These too, Mussulmen in faith, are not so in practice. "In some places they are still serfs of the soil; in others they hold lands, for the use of which they

pay heavy rents to the Hindu lords. Like all the aboriginal race, they claim to be the real proprietors of the land, and they remind one another of this right in the following distich:

"'The Rajah is proprietor of his share:
"'I am the proprietor of the land.'"[1]

They also maintain the rite of marking the new Rajput prince with the bloody spot—in default of which ceremony their loyalty could not be depended upon.

Immediately to the west of the Bhils, between them and the sea, are the *Kulis*. These are fishermen, and from their having been early employed as menials by the foreign residents, their name, Kulis or Coolies, has been taken as the name of servants, commonly.

South of the Bhils are found many classes of degraded people, undoubtedly separate from the Hindu stock, while dwelling in the villages. Such are the low *Mhars*, which, though the offscouring of the population, have unquestionably given the name to the Mahratta country.

Dr. Wilson of Bombay has given us some interesting facts respecting a few wild tribes of the northern Konkan.

Waralis. This is a wandering tribe, having but few affinities to the Hindu family. To elicit information, Dr. W. propounded questions, a few of which with the answers we transcribe."

"Do any of you keep more wives than one?

"Re! Re! we can scarcely feed one; why should we think of more?"

"How do you treat your children when they disobey your orders?"

"We scold them."

"Do you never whip your children?" "What! strike our own offspring? We never strike them?"

"When your wives disobey your commands, how do you treat them?" "We give them chastisement, less or more. How could we manage them without striking them?"

---

[1] Jour. Roy. As. Soc. Vol. XIII. p. 289.

"What God do you worship?" "We worship Waghia (the lord of tigers)."

"Has he any form?" "He is a shapeless stone smeared with red lead and ghee."

"How do you worship him?" "We give him chickens and goats, break cocoa-nuts on his head, and pour oil on him."

"What does your god give to you?" "He preserves us from tigers, gives us good crops, and keeps disease from us."

"Who inflicts pain on you?" "Waghia, when we don't worship him."

"Does he ever enter your bodies?" "Yes; he seizes us by the throat like a cat; he sticks to our bodies."

"Do you ever scold Waghia?" "To be sure we do. We say, 'You fellow, we have given you a chicken, a goat, and yet you strike us! What more do you want?'"

"Where do good people go after death?" "They go to Bhagavan (the self-existent)."

"Where is Bhagavan?" "We don't know where he is and where he is not."

Katodis or *Kathkuris.* These receive their name from the Kath-echu, which they gather from the *Acacia Catechu.* They are even more degraded than the Waralis, hanging upon the outskirts of villages of other tribes. They eat anything, from a rat to a serpent, except the brown-faced monkey, which they affirm to be possessed of a human soul.

They say, "God comes like the wind, and goes like the wind." They bury their dead. Their aged men are their priests, but they have few ceremonies. Before felling a single tree for the Catechu, they select one, constitute it a god, and solicit its favor.[1]

The *Ramusis*, a people living now in a district between 17° and 20° north latitude, have found a historian in Capt. Alex. Mackintosh of the Madras army.[2] They attained a notoriety, not only from their ordinary predatory habits, but from their having been so successfully employed by the famous Sivaji, in his contests with the lords of the south, so

[1] J. R. A. S. 1842, p. 14. [2] Origin and condition of the Ramoosies.

vividly portrayed by Elphinstone in his History of India. The Ramusis are considered to have come from the east or south-east of Hydrabad, in the ancient kingdom of Telinga, from the large admixture of Telugu in their speech. Their name means "Foresters." They are robbers, but among them, as so frequently in India, the proverb "set a thief to catch a thief" is literally carried out. Thieves themselves, they are the only reliable village watchmen. They are an extremely enterprising, hardy, active people, but covetous, rapacious, and treacherous. Perjury is deemed but a trifling offence. Their religion does not differ materially from that of the inhabitants of the Dekhan generally.

Still further to the South are the Nilagiri Hills (*nila*—blue: *giri*—hill). They lie between 11° and 12°, forming, it is often said, the nucleus of the eastern and western Ghats, and are well known to all foreigners for their affording such a delightful retreat from the oppressive heat of the plains.

An extended account of these hills and their inhabitants has been published by Captain Harkness, and a pleasing sketch has also been furnished by Rev. Mr. Dulles in his interesting little volume, Life in India.

At the base of the mountain and occupying also a belt of one or two thousand feet towards the summit, are two races called *Erulars* and *Curumbars*, nomade shepherds, the latter of whom are much dreaded by the other inhabitants.

Above these two tribes are the *Kôtas* or *Cohatars* (cow-killers). They are the craftsmen of the hills, and are the lowest of the low, feeders on carrion; following, like vultures, in the track of a buffalo herd, waiting for a victim. They have no caste, and worship ideal gods of their own, of whom they have no images.

Still above these are the *Burghers*, more properly called *Badagas*. These are the most numerous, wealthy, and civilized class on the hills, but are not aboriginal there; having migrated from the Canarese country within a known period. One custom, however, would seem to indicate that they have departed from their fathers' faith. They worship the sun, when they arise in the morning, and, "on entering the house in the

evening, they address the lamp, the visible emblem of their deity: "thou creator of this and of all worlds, the greatest of the great, who art with us, as well in the mountain as in the wilderness, who keepest the wreaths that adorn the head from fading, who guardest the foot from the thorn, god among a hundred, may we be prosperous!"

But the class of inhabitants which, though least numerous, has always attracted most attention, is the *Todas*. They are a tall, athletic race; and, from their physical appearance, have even been deemed a colony of Greeks. They are so much the reverse, in character, of the inhabitants of the plain, as to have become quite the favorites of Europeans. They are a simple, pastoral people, depending mostly upon their herds of buffaloes, loving peace, having no warlike weapons; and yet, by their quiet demeanor and peaceful disposition, commanding the respect and reverence of their ruder neighbors. They are a lively, "laughter-loving" race, having none of the cringing servility of the Hindu; but rather a confiding frankness, and modest but manly bearing, all in pleasing contrast to the people about them. They have temples to Truth, although, it must be confessed, not always conforming their practice to their faith.

The religion of these Todas is quite bare, but unique. They disbelieve transmigration, affirming that upon death the soul goes to the great country. They have what may be termed lactariums, dairy-houses, to which they attach a certain sacredness. They are small huts, scarcely allowing of ingress; divided into two compartments; the inner, the more holy; and yet containing nothing connected with worship, unless it be a roll of buffalo butter. Women are not allowed to enter this house; nor the men, at all times; the boys only having free access. A Brahman is refused admittance; and they despise his authority.

They have another class of sacred places, called *teriris*, among the hills. The priest appointed to them, must divest himself of his former sinful raiment, and lead a life of celibacy, although free to renounce his priesthood. He is holy: so holy, that no Toda dare approach or look upon him.

"The teriri is of conical form, the thatch very neatly put on, and surmounted, at the top, with a stone about a foot in diameter. A bell, which is generally deposited in some niche within the temple, is the only object to which they pay any reverence. To this they pour out libations of milk, but only as to a sacred implement. They do not sacrifice or offer incense, or make any oblations to it, significant of its having, in their estimation, any latent or mystic properties. To each teriri is attached a herd of milch buffaloes, part of which are sacred. One among the sacred animals is the chief. Should it die, its calf, if a female one, succeeds to the office; should it have no female calf, the bell before mentioned is attached to the neck of one of the other sacred ones, and, being allowed to remain so during that day, a legal succession is considered to be effected."

This association of the herds with religious ceremonies, is particularly noticeable at their funerals: when one dies, a large company assembles in the neighborhood of one of these teriris, to which the relics of the departed are brought, wrapped in a mantle. The ceremony lasts several days. When the mantle is first spread out in the temple, the company, one by one, enter and spend a few moments in wailing. From fifteen to twenty buffaloes are then driven into an enclosure, and the men leap in after them. Then, joining hands, they dance wildly, round and round, until the buffaloes become excited to phrenzy. At a given signal, all rush upon the animals, and seek to fasten a bell to the neck of each. No stratagem is used, but they conquer them by sheer force of arm. Eight or nine men are often seen hanging on one, yelling with all their might, and doing all they can by beating the animal with clubs, to enrage it still more, and still further jeopardize the party. Three or four animals are thus attacked, and, the bell being attached to the neck of each, they are liberated, the successful combatants giving a shout of victory; then, shouldering their clubs and joining their hands, they recommence the dance.

On the next morning, the relics are brought out and laid on the ground. After a variety of ceremonies, the whole

company addresses the buffaloes as "dii animales," beseeching them to intercede for blessings upon themselves and their property, "that their feet may escape the thorn, their heads the falling rock."

A young heifer is now slain, and its blood sprinkled over the mantle. The mantle is then removed to another spot, and after a general lamentation, the whole herd is slaughtered, each animal being brought so that its dying breath shall waft the relics as it passes; and, after death, is placed so that its mouth and nostrils shall rest upon the mantle.

"The whole scene," says Capt. Harkness, describing one of these funerals, "was a wild one. The dance kept on; the club men shouted as they brought forward a fresh victim; in the centre of the relics were two silver-headed matrons, silently weeping; around them were the slaughtered animals; and among them, the crowd of mourners, males and females, young and old, sitting in pairs, face to face, 'with drooping foreheads meeting;' the whole throng uniting in one universal moan, with which, as it rose and fell, was heard the wailing pipe, breathing in unison the solemn notes of grief and sorrow."

It is supposed that infanticide was once common among the Todas, but it is now unknown. Polyandry is frequent.

Passing northward from Madras, along the line of the eastern Ghats, we meet a number of aboriginal tribes, many sunk into the lowest degradation, hardly superior to the apes among whom they have their residence. Still going to the north, we come, finally, to the termination of the range, where it reaches out toward the eastern extremity of the Vindhya mountains, where it is met, also, by spurs from the hills which separate India from the Chinese frontier. In this extensive tract of country are several races which await our notice.

In the district of Ganjam are three tribes: to the north, the *Kols;* to the south, the *Sours;* and in the centre, the *Khonds.* Of the three we shall mention only the last, as we have fuller information respecting them than we have of any other

tribe of aborigines, through the reports of Capt. Macpherson, who was agent in these hills.[1]

Of the three regions, Alpine, sub-Alpine, and Maritime, into which these eastern Ghats are naturally divided, the Alpine, or highest, is the special abode of the Khonds. They were, until brought into partial subjection by the British, wholly free and lawless, having intercourse only with the Zemindars of the middle region, with whom they contracted a sort of mutual alliance. They live by tillage; and since the British have gained their confidence, trade has assumed quite an honorable position.

It is, however, of their religion that we wish particularly to speak.

There are two sects among the Khonds: agreeing in some points, differing in others. All believe in one supreme being, self-existing, the source of good, and creator of the universe, of the inferior gods, and of man. His name is Boora Pennu, the god of light, or Bella Pennu, the sun-god. Boora Pennu, in the beginning, created a consort, Tari Pennu, the earth-goddess, and the source of evil. He then formed the earth. Finding Tari destitute of affection, so much so as even to refuse to scratch his back when requested kindly so to do, Boora determined to form man, who should love him, and also everything upon earth to delight man. He did so: the creation was free from moral and physical evil; men had free intercourse with God; lived on the spontaneous fruits of the earth, in peace and harmony. They went unclothed, unharmed by animals, with power to move through sea and air.

But Tari, bent on blasting this fair creation, "sowed the seeds of sin in mankind as in a ploughed field," and introduced, besides, all physical evil into the material creation. Boora Pennu at once applied antidotes, arresting and controlling physical evil, but leaving man free to be holy, or to sin. A few remained wholly sinless, and were at once deified; the rest transgressed, and upon them Boora let loose all evil,

[1] J. R. A. S. 1842, 1852.

ordaining death to be the penalty of sin. Earth itself was affected by the general curse: poisons and diseases spread; man went clothed, was limited to earth, and sunk into abject degradation. War between Boora and Tari continued hotly; mountains, whirlwinds, and meteors being the missiles used.

Here belief divides: one party claiming that Boora was victorious; the other, that Tari conquered. Both call Boora the source of good; but the latter party affirm that Tari inflicts what evil she pleases, and should be supplicated to refrain from that, and even to impart positive blessings.

Boora, his sect affirm, in order not to lose his work, and to return to men their purity, created three grades of gods: I. The judge of the dead, and those who should regulate the powers of nature in the service of man, among whom are the gods of the chase, war, rain, and boundaries. II. Deified holy men. III. Local deities, unlimited in number, who fill all nature, and naturally vary with different localities. Such are the gods of streams, tanks, fountains, forests, etc.

The Khonds affirm that man has four souls: I. A soul which may be restored to communion with Boora. II. A soul belonging to some special tribe, constantly re-born in that tribe, and that only. III. A soul which suffers for sin, and transmigrates, and may temporarily quit the body at the will of a god. IV. A soul which dies at the dissolution of the body.

The judge of the dead resides on a great rock beyond the sea, where the sun rises. To this rock the souls of men speed straight after death, and it is called the leaping-rock, from the desperate attempts necessary to gain a foothold upon it, in which many break their limbs and knock out their eyes, incurring a deformity attaching to them in the next birth. The good become like gods, have power of intercession, and are worshipped; the bad are punished with all manner of diseases; and, worse than all, with base moral qualities.

The chief crimes are: I. To refuse hospitality, or to abandon a guest. II. To break an oath or promise, or to deny a gift. III. To speak falsely, except to save a guest.

IV. To break a solemn pledge of friendship. V. To break an old law or custom. VI. To commit incest. VII. To contract debts, the payment of which is ruinous to a tribe, which is responsible for the engagements of all its members. VIII. To skulk in time of war. IX. To betray a public secret.

The chief virtues are: I. To kill a foe in public battle. II. To fall in public battle. III. To be a priest. IV. (among the sacrificing tribes) To be a victim to the earth-goddess.

At the fall, a priesthood was appointed to mediate between man and God; but it is an elective order, or rather a free class, any one entering it who thinks he has a call. The Khonds have no images nor temples. Their gods have the human form, but are of ethereal texture, dwelling in chinks of the earth, whence they emerge and flit about, at a height of about two cubits from the ground, seen only by the lower animals. They love, quarrel, marry, have children; and the minor gods grow old and die. They live on flesh. Each grade worships the one above it, while all worship Boora. All the individual gods are worshipped by the people, except the judge of the dead. The inferior gods are invariably honored with sacrifices, a hog being deemed the most sacred animal. Boora Pennu is also worshipped; but sacrifice to him is rare. At such times, the history of creation is recited at length.

Opposed to the sect of Boora is that of Tari, who give her the credit of man's elevation. They affirm that, in a feminine form, called Ambally Bylee, she revealed to men the arts of life, especially agriculture, to make the latter of which lucrative, she enjoined upon men the rite of human sacrifice.

This rite of human sacrifice, which has given the Khonds such an unenviable distinction, is performed by tribes at specified seasons; by communities and by individuals, upon any occasion which seems to demand it. The victims, called "Merias," are *always* purchased. They insist on this, and plead it in extenuation, when they commit the sacrifice, crying out: "We bought you with a price." They are obtained

from a class of men who traffic in them ; and who, when the supply fails, frequently sell their own children, while the Khonds will even sell to one another. A young child is preferred as a purchase. He is brought, blindfolded, to the village, and suffered there to roam at liberty, until needed. He is sacred ; all houses are open to him ; marriage with him is courted. He frequently grows up, marries, and has children ; who, in turn, must be victims. They rarely seek to escape. Once, however, as the people were preparing to immolate a youth, he said to the chief: "In suffering this death I become a god, and I do not resist my fate ; let me then partake, with you, in the joy of the festival." The chief assented ; and the young man called for a bowl, and drank, while the crowd contended fiercely for the dregs of a liquor so consecrated. He then danced and sung, and called for an axe, that he might once more join his companions, armed like a free man. An axe was handed him : he danced about ; and, of a sudden, clove the priest's skull in two, rushed across a foaming torrent, and down the Ghat, into the territory of a chief who refused to deliver him up to his infuriated pursuers.

For several days before the rite is performed, the people indulge in the most licentious riot. The victim is brought into the neighboring Meria grove, a sacred, haunted place, and anointed for the sacrifice. The acceptable spot for sacrifice is found during the night previous by probing the ground about the village, the first deep chink into which the stick passes being regarded as the spot chosen by the earth-goddess.

About noon of the third day, the orgies terminate, and the assemblage proceeds, with stunning shouts and pealing music, to consummate the sacrifice. A long and remarkable dialogue now ensues between two persons who impersonate the priest and the victim ; in which the victim, in turn, inveighs against his persecutors and supplicates for freedom, and the priest justifies the act. The victim finally says :

"I am dying ; I call upon all — upon those who bought me, on those whose food I have eaten, on those who are

strangers here, on all who will now share my flesh — let all curse the priest to the gods!"

A post is now fastened in the chosen spot; around it four large posts are set up, and the victim placed in the middle. The priest takes a green branch, cleaves it in the centre, inserts into the cleft the victim's neck or chest, and then, slightly wounding him with an axe, the whole vast crowd, shouting "We bought you with a price," fling themselves upon the body and strip the flesh from the bones, leaving untouched only the head and intestines.

Every village is represented at these great festivals, of which the above is a brief account, and the flesh which each village receives as its portion, is again subdivided; so that the head of each family has a shred, which he may bury in his field, and thus ensure a plentiful crop. A year after the sacrifice, a hog is offered up, as if to remind Tari of the faithfulness of her followers. The disciples of Boora, it must be remembered, abhor this rite.

The custom has been partially suppressed; but except in a few districts, says Lieut. Frye, "the votaries of human sacrifices are, as yet, almost wholly unchecked in the observance of the rite, and virtually independent of European control."[1]

The custom of female infanticide also prevails, and, in some of the tribes of the sect of Boora to such an extent, that scarcely a female infant is spared. The numberless quarrels which arise from the looseness of the marriage tie, probably have given origin to this fearful custom.

To the west of Orissa, the country of the Khonds, is Gondwana, the country of the *Gonds*. This region would seem, from its position, to have been more exempt than any other from Aryan invasion. It lies along the southern side of the Vindhya mountains, which have ever proved a formidable barrier to the progress of the Sanskrit-speaking race.

North of the Khonds, and partly mingled with them, are the *Kols*, the best known of whom are the *Ho*. Still to the

[1] J. R. A. S. Vol. XVII.

north of the Ho, and extending quite into Central India are the *Sontals*, sometimes regarded as a division of the Kols, who have in late years specially attracted European attention. They incline to a simple form of religion, believing in witchcraft, and making much account of tigers, as in swearing upon their skin, etc. On the Rajmahal hills, and scattered everywhere in the hills of Eastern India, are many other tribes, also claiming to be classed as aboriginal. All these latter, however, we shall be precluded from dwelling upon by the limits of this essay. They have the same general characteristics which mark the tribes already treated of. For the same reason we can only refer, in passing, to several migratory tribes, found throughout the peninsula, who have been noticed by Balfour,[1] and also to the wild *Veddahs* of Ceylon, of whom Sir Emerson Tennent has given so full and interesting an account in his new work on that island.[2]

We have now concluded our survey of the hill tribes of India. It is these hill tribes that we have supposed to represent the remnants of an aboriginal race. They do so; and, in Northern India, they alone. In the Dekhan, however, we have surmised (owing to the fact that the Sanskrit-speaking race entered it not as conquerors, but as colonists), that there might be found dwellers in the plains, as well as on the hills, who would be radically different from the race which had gained the ascendency. And such is the fact. Even among the Mahrati people, who, more than others of the Dekhan have succumbed to their rulers, we find traces of the presence of a faith wholly at variance with Brahmanism. Many of these have been collected and specified by Dr. Stevenson, in the Journals of the Royal Asiatic Society and its Bombay branch. But it is in the extreme south of the Dekhan, and among the Tamil-speaking population, that these differences appear the most marked. Leaving out of view various minor points of divergence from Brahmanism found among all classes, we wish to direct attention, in closing this survey, to one portion of the laboring classes of Tinnevelly and Travancore.

[1] Edinb. Philos. Journal, Vol. XXXV., 1843. [2] Ceylon. Part IX., Chap. 3.

We refer to the *Shanars*, the best account of whom has been furnished by Rev. Mr. Caldwell, in his little pamphlet entitled "The Shanars of Tinnevelly." They are toddy-drawers, and, in pursuit of their business, are forced to lead a very laborious life.

Their religion is almost wholly a demon-worship, the worship of spirits as evil. These demons have, it is held, been thrust down from some higher existence, and now wreak their vengeance on unoffending man. They are the deities of all diseases.

A curious instance of native opinions respecting diseases, is found in the notions prevalent, in South India, respecting *cholera*. The natives say that small-pox was the sport of the goddess Ammâl; but that when the English came and introduced vaccination, and thus thwarted her designs, Ammâl, in revenge, sent *cholera*. They are loth to be vaccinated, through dread of arousing her displeasure. They speak of cholera only as "that disease." If a man die of it, they say simply "he is not," and never wail, as at other times; but go about their work.

These demons flit about, usually at a span's remove from the ground, never touching it, but alighting upon certain points, as spires, roofs and eaves of houses, dwelling in holes in the rocks or decayed trees. They are seen, at dark, whirling about the leaves and dust, and cross your track at every turn. Their residence being so uncertain, one may chance to build a house or dig a well in places to which they have a prior claim, and so incur their displeasure.

They accordingly have a class of priests, not a privileged sect, but open to all, who, as familiar with the haunts of these spirits, may warn of danger or avert the calamity consequent upon trespass. They have temples, though of no pretensions, usually mud sheds, or even bare walls. They have also idols, who represent the various demons. These demons they propitiate, by means of offerings and sacrifices of animals; in which we may, perhaps, see the idea of *substitution*.

A dance always accompanies the sacrifice; and a man is

chosen to officiate as priest, clad in appropriate garments. We extract the following graphic description from Mr. Caldwell's work above mentioned :

" When the preparations are completed, and the dance about to commence, the music is, at first, comparatively slow, and the dancer seems impassive and sullen ; and either he stands still, or moves about in gloomy silence. Gradually, as the music becomes quicker and louder, his excitement begins to rise. Sometimes, to help to work himself up into a phrenzy, he uses medicated draughts; cuts and lacerates his flesh till the blood flows; lashes himself with a huge whip; presses a burning torch to his breast ; drinks the blood which flows from his wounds, or drinks the blood of the sacrifice, putting the throat of the decapitated goat to his mouth. Then, as if he had acquired a new life, he begins to brandish his staff of bells, and dance with a quick, but wild, unsteady step. Suddenly the *afflatus* descends. There is no mistaking that glare, or those frantic leaps. He snorts, he stares, he gyrates. The demon has now taken bodily possession of him ; and though he retains the power of utterance and of motion, both are under the demon's control, and his separate consciousness is in abeyance. The bystanders signalize the event by raising a long shout attended by a peculiar vibrating motion.

The devil-dancer is now worshipped as a present deity; and every bystander consults him respecting his disease, his wants, the welfare of his absent relations, and the offerings which are to be made for the accomplishment of his wishes."

In the later Puranas we find allusions to this system of demonolatry ; and Mr. Caldwell thinks that the " sacrifice of Daksha," in the " Vaya Purana," given as a note, by Wilson in the Vishnu Purana, is but the mythical record of the adoption of these rites into the Brahmanical system.[1]

It is quite foreign to the design of the present Article, to dwell at length upon the ethnical affinities of the several tribes which we have now considered. We cannot, however,

[1] Vishnu Purana, p. 61.

forbear presenting, in conclusion, a brief statement of the present position of this question.

Prof. Rask was the first to suggest a *Scythian* origin for the various un-Sanskritic dialects of India. His suggestion has been followed out, more in detail, by various subsequent scholars. Dr. Stevenson, in a series of articles in the Royal Asiatic Journal, sought to prove the identity of origin of all the aboriginal languages, including the foreign element in the northern vernaculars. Mr. Hodgson, to whom too much praise cannot be awarded for his enthusiastic labors, has found, he thinks, evidence of the essential unity of the sub-Himalayan, Indo-Chinese, and Eastern Indian dialects; and has confidently affirmed the connection between all Indian aborigines. He has sought, also, to add strength to his argument by evidence grounded upon physical similarities, in a passage which we cannot refrain from quoting.[1]

"A practised eye will distinguish, at a glance, between the Arian and Tamulian style of features and form — a practised pen will readily make the distinction felt — but to perceive and to make others perceive, by pen or pencil, the physical traits that separate each group, or people of Arian or of Tamulian extraction, from each other group, would be a task indeed! In the Arian form (Hindu) there is height, symmetry, lightness, and flexibility. In the Arian face, an oval contour, with ample forehead, and moderate jaws and mouth; a round chin, perpendicular with the forehead; a regular set of distinct and fine features; a well-raised and unexpanded nose, with elliptic nares; a well-sized and finely opened eye, running directly across the face; no want of eyebrow, eyelash, or beard; and, lastly, a clear brunette complexion, often not darker than that of the most southern Europeans.

In the Tamulian form, on the contrary, there is less height, less symmetry, more dumpiness, and flesh. In the Tamulian face, a somewhat lozenge contour, caused by the large cheek bones; less perpendicularity in the features to the front, occasioned, not so much by defect of forehead or chin, as by

[1] Jour. As. Soc. Beng. July, 1849.

excess of jaws and mouth; a large proportion of face to head, and less roundness in the latter; a broader, flatter face, with features less symmetrical, but perhaps more expressive, at least of individuality; a shorter, wider nose, often clubbed at the end, and furnished with round nostrils; eyes less, and less fully opened, and less evenly crossing the face by their line of aperture; ears, larger; lips, thicker; beard, deficient; color, brunette, as in the last, but darker on the whole, and, as in it, very various."

Stevenson and Hodgson have been followed by Max Muller, in his "Turanian Researches," embodied in Bunsen's "Philosophy of History." He has taken up the labors of his predecessors, and sought to present their general result. He has accordingly, after a comparison of the Scythic languages with the aboriginal dialects of India, come to the conclusion that all the latter, which he styles "Nishada," are related to one another, and themselves, more to the *Ugric* branch of the Scythian family than to any other. This is his general position, although he, of course, recognizes the modification, in many separate dialects, from contact with other foreign tribes upon the frontier.

But the latest, and by far the most authoritative writer in his own province, is the Rev. R. Caldwell, who in his "Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages," has thoroughly treated the several Dekhan languages, their mutual affinities, and their probable affiliations with the other dialects of India and those foreign to it. Through his investigation, he has been led to a result differing somewhat from that reached by his fellow laborers.

It is well known that the dialects of North India are regarded, by the most competent judges, as offshoots of the Sanskrit. They, however, differ from the Sanskrit. They differ, as the modern Romance languages do from the Latin, in being the result of a disintegration of the parent tongue, but more radically, in that they possess a prominent structural element, with which the Sanskrit has no affinity. Indeed, so marked is this element, that some observers have refused to acknowledge the Sanskrit origin of these tongues.

The question at once arises: Is this un-Sanskrit element, in the northern vernaculars, identical with the more prominent un-Sanskrit element in the dialects of the south? Stevenson, Hodgson, and Muller answer in the affirmative; Caldwell, in the negative. The latter contends urgently for the Scythian origin of what he terms the *Dravidian*, or South Indian languages; he is also fully persuaded of the Scythian origin of the un-Sanskrit portion of the northern vernaculars; but he affirms that the latter are no more closely allied to the Dravidian, than to some other branches of the great Scythic family; that, consequently, these must be arranged in this family, not as one dialect, but as sister dialects. His opinion he offers in these words:

"The differences which appear to exist between the Dravidian languages and the Scythian under-stratum of the northern vernaculars, induce me to incline to the supposition that the Dravidian idioms belong to an older period of the Scythian speech — the period of the predominance of the Ugro-Finnish languages in Central and Higher Asia, anterior to the westward migration of the Turks and Mongolians. If this supposition is correct, it seems to follow that the progenitors of the Scythian portion of the Sudras and mixed classes now inhabiting the northern and western provinces, must have made their way into India subsequently to the Dravidians; and also that they must have thrust out the Dravidians from the greater part of Northern India, before they were, in their turn, subdued by a new race of invaders."[1]

He also strongly denies that Mr. Hodgson's description of the Tamulian races will apply to the Dravidian people, and even affirms that, on purely physical evidence, they should be connected with the Arian race.

He enumerates nine Dravidian languages: Tamil, Telugu, Canarese, Malayâlam, Tulu, Toda, Kôta, Gônd, and Khond. To these he would add, as containing a Dravidian element, the Rajmahal, Uraon, and lastly Brahui of Beluchistan. He insists on the connection of the last with the Tamil and kin-

[1] Comp. Drav. Gram. p. 70.

dred tongues, and finds in its presence the indication of the course by which the Dravidians entered India.

The affiliation of the above mentioned languages may be considered as nearly settled. Mr. Hodgson's researches would also seem to connect together the various dialects of Eastern India, and refer them possibly to the nearest neighbors of the Scythian stock, while the un-Sanskrit portion of the northern dialects still awaits careful analysis.

We had hoped to mention the efforts of the East India Government and of missionary societies, to civilize and christianize these rude tribes. But the Article is even now, we fear, too long. Government has found that, among them, a kind word has been more potent than a hard blow; while missionaries of the gospel have found readier hearers among them, than where Brahmanism has benumbed the sensibility and steeled the heart.

ARTICLE III.

THE RESURRECTION AND ITS CONCOMITANTS.[1]

BY REV. E. RUSSELL, D. D., EAST RANDOLPH.

THE discourse that fell from the lips of the great teacher of the Gentiles on Mars Hill at Athens, has never failed in power to excite thought and feeling in the human mind, and awaken discussion in every age. In the production of this effect, all the circumstances of time, place, the subject-matter of what was uttered, the character of the speaker and of those who listened, unite to secure. He stood in the midst of the city that was the "eye of Greece," and has been the

[1] *Authors to which reference has been had in the preparation of this Article* — Anastasis, or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and

school of the world. He spoke from the place, where the voice of the orator had so often —

> "Shook the arsenal and fulmined over Greece
> To Macedon and Artaxerxes' throne."

He stood in the presence of an immense assembly, in the midst of Grecian temples, surrounded on every hand with the creations of Grecian art, and taste, and learning, and sketched, in bold and graphic outlines, the theme of redemption by Christ. The records of oratory supply nothing that is a parallel in dignity, and grandeur, and interest, with what was here uttered. Into this discourse, the grand features of essential truth were condensed; and the image had more power to stir emotion and thought, than all the wonders of Grecian architecture, statuary, or painting. The audience to which it was addressed, the place where it was delivered, and the massive truth which it embodies, conspire to make it a monument that will stand beautiful, attractive, and sublime long after the last fragments of the Parthenon shall have crumbled back to dust. The audience, the most cultivated and intelligent, doubtless, in the then known world, listened to the speaker with apparent attention and respect till the resurrection of the dead was affirmed. The assembly then became restive, the discourse itself was suspended, and a further hearing at the great forum of Attic eloquence, was denied. To an Athenian, the doctrine of a future state of existence was familiar. It was to him no new thing. The doctrine of re-

---

Scripturally considered, by George Bush, Professor of Hebrew, New York City University.

Eschatology, or the Scripture Docrine of the coming of our Lord, the Judgment and the Resurrection, by Samuel Lee. Boston : J. E. Tilton & Co. 1859.

Resurrection of the same Body asserted from the traditions of the Heathen, the Ancient Jews, and the Primitive Church, with an answer to the objections brought against it. By Humphry Hody, D. D., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford and London, 1694.

The Apologetics of the Athenian Philosopher, Athenagoras. 1. For the Christian Religion. 2. For the truth of the Resurrection, etc. By David Humphrys, B. A., of Trinity College, in Cambridge, London, 1714.

Landis, on the Resurrection of the Body, 1846.

Landis, on the Immortality of the Soul, 1859.

tribution was not for the first time, in the year of our Lord fifty-two, learned by him on Mars Hill. The Athenian believed and he had been taught to believe, from the days of Homer and Solomon, by all the poets, philosophers, and orators of his country, that there was a scene of future and endless happiness, or of misery in reserve for every man in that world, to which death would introduce him. But the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and of the reunion of soul and body in that future world, was, for the philosophical Athenian, too absurd to be believed, too irrational and strange to command a respectful hearing, or receive anything at his hands but mockery and contempt. In this feeling many, in every age of our world, have sympathized; and many who have not shared in this sympathy, have felt difficulties and doubts in reference to it by no means easy to be removed or relieved.

The church of Christ, with almost entire unanimity, has believed and taught that the conversion of the world is to be effected through the instrumentality of preaching, accompanied by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; that the Saviour will appear a second time, not "to seek and save the lost," but to raise the dead, of all the generations of earth, and bring the entire world to judgment; and that, with this second advent of Christ, which is to take place in some unknown period of the future, the world itself will end, and the scenes of an eternal and perfect retribution begin. The doctrines of an intermediate state, of a resurrection of the dead, a final judgment, and end of the world, are the themes which, together, constitute what is designated a Christian Eschatology, and are really so connected or involved with each other, that all must stand or fall together.

The resurrection of the dead, or the resurrection from the dead, is the point of attack, therefore, that has been most fiercely assailed. Both of these phrases occur, repeatedly, in the language of the New Testament. The resurrection of the body is peremptorily and perseveringly denied. It is affirmed that the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, or *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν*, designates simply and only a future state of exist-

ence. The resurrection is declared to be an affair of every day occurrence. It takes place with every man at the instant of his death. As the globe, according to late estimates, is supposed to contain a population of some thirteen hundred millions, and as thirty-two millions die annually, and ninety or a hundred thousand daily, so some ninety or a hundred thousand pass daily to a resurrection state. At death, there is eliminated from these physical bodies, that have been transmitted to us from our first father, some subtle, ethereal, undefinable substance, in which the soul is enveloped while in its earthly tabernacle, so that soul and body enter, at once, on a changeless state of perfection and glory. We are not told exactly where, while in these physical structures, lie the germs of the body, that is to be thus eliminated — whether about the cranium, or above or below the diaphragm : we are assured, however, that they exist; we are not informed by what microscopic power they become visible, or whether they can be made visible at all; these germs exist, it is affirmed, in the bodies which we bear about with us, from day to day; and the uninitiated, therefore, that cannot see, must walk by faith. It is further affirmed, that this resurrection body, that is eliminated at the death of every man, is developed by a natural law and not by the direct agency or power of God, as the scriptures unequivocally declare. There is, therefore, no intermediate state, no day of final judgment nor any end of the world, or termination of the present constitution of things in conformity with the uniform belief of the church of Christ in every age.

We have now stated the common and received doctrine in reference to the resurrection and its concomitants; and the theories that have been avowed and urged in opposition to it. It will not be inappropriate, therefore, that we should state, in this connection, the grounds on which these theories are alleged to rest, and weigh their validity as arguments in opposition to the received doctrines. As we have intimated, it is the resurrection of the body that has been singled out and made the chief point of attack. On this have all the batteries of the enemy been opened. Hither have

all their missiles been hurled. They have rightly judged that, if this position could be effectually stormed and carried, the work of demolition along all the ramparts of revealed truth, would not long linger. Few doctrines, therefore, of the Christian scriptures, have encountered more objections than that of a resurrection from the dead. Against few, if any, have these objections been urged with more vigor, more learning, more of apparent thoughtfulness and respect, or more of a truly Athenian contempt. Natural science, in its every department, has been searched, and its results adduced (where they are supposed to have a disadvantageous bearing) to throw discredit on this doctrine of revelation. To these philosophical objections, as they have been designated, we now turn ; and, that no injustice may be done, we shall state them, for the most part, in the language which scepticism itself has sanctioned, if not rendered venerable.

1. This inquiry is submitted and alleged to be sufficient to settle the question of the resurrection of the body : How can the dead come forth from their graves,when they are not there? The Saviour asserts that all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth. The sea, it is said in the visions of Patmos, gave up[1] the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man according to their works. But it is affirmed that the body, as life departs, reverts to dust; that it is dissolved into the original or simple elements of which it is composed, and that these elements again enter into combination with the oak, the pine on the mountain tops, the grass, the flowers of the field, and with the herds and the flocks that graze the plains and the mountain sides. Let it be affirmed, therefore, by whom it may, is the defiant interrogatory, how can bodies come forth from their graves, when they are not there? The dead that sunk to sleep on the fields of Waterloo, the thousands of widows that have been burned on the funeral piles of their husbands, the four hundred millions (as it has been estimated) deposited in the catacombs of Egypt, and taken from thence in great numbers, and, in

[1] Rev. 20 : 13.

the form of dried mummies, used for the purposes of fuel in the dwellings of the natives, or for firing engines on their railways, must have vanished, it is said, beyond all power of recovery. How are the bodies of all these, and of all the generations that will have lived and died on the earth, to reappear in the twinkling of an eye, when they must have become blended with an infinitude of other organizations of beast and bird and fish and insect, "that which no eye can see, no glass can reach." How are the bodies of the dead thus to reappear, when different human bodies must have equal claims to the particles which compose them? How are the dead to come forth from their graves, after being reduced to ashes on a funeral pile, or consumed in the fires of a railway engine?

Now in regard to this objection it may be well to note that the Saviour does not affirm that all are in graves. His language is not that of a universal, but of a particular, proposition. All that are in their graves, shall hear his voice and come forth. In Rev. 20: 13 the sea, and death and hell, delivered up the dead that were in them. The Saviour's language, therefore, does not imply that all are in their graves; but, that such as are, shall hear his voice and come forth: while the Christian scriptures, taken as a whole, as in the passages here cited, assert, in the most positive and unqualified form, that the dead of the entire race of man shall come forth to judgment. On the supposition, then, that the fifteen or sixteen original or simple elements, of which every human body is composed, are to be collected from the four winds of heaven, at the instant of the resurrection, is there in it anything more adapted to excite surprise or wonder, than that these same elements, every day of our lives, should come from these same four winds, and become bone, and muscle, and ligament, and texture in the bodies which we bear about with us, from day to day? On the supposition that it is so — which we neither affirm nor believe — will it be a development so peculiar or unique in this universe, as to forestall all inquiry by the contradiction which it involves, or the absurdity which it bears on its face? Is there not a process, that has been in unceasing action with each of us

from the instant that the phenomena of life began, as unique and wonderful as such a resurrection of the dead? If the particles of matter, if the fifteen original substances which enter into combination in forming the structure of these bodies, have been gathered from torrid climes, from beneath the poles, from the depths of ocean, from the banks of the Mississippi, the Danube, the Ganges, and the spicy islands of the sea, why may not the same original particles be collected again, should occasion require, and become united in that incorruptible, immortal, vigorous, and spiritual body, which the scriptures affirm will rise up from every grave, from the ocean and the land, at the sound of the archangel's trump? If a particle of magnetic matter will penetrate what we designate a solid; if light will make, for itself, a path through a composition of silex and alkali, and in a second of time wing its way through two hundred thousand miles of space; if the substance electricity will pass among the particles of a copper or an iron solid, under ocean and over all the plains of earth in a twinkling, and proclaim to a world what has transpired, who shall say what may or may not be done with such of the original particles of these physical bodies as may be requisite to form the incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual body of the resurrection? The natural world has limits for intellectual powers limited like our own; boundaries, beyond which no ken of earth will ever reach, whatever progress may yet be made in unfolding the phenomena of the material universe and its laws. To the human mind, there are certainly mysteries in the facts, in all the ultimate facts of physical science. Among men, few are found who have much to allege against them by way of objection, but the incorrigibles and incapables of our world. As to any very grave doubts, which such persons may either conceive or express, or thick clouds with which they may envelop their own vision or that of others, we apprehend that their effect upon the whole grand movement of the universe of God, will be a little like that of the barnacles on the ship's bottom, which do not greatly disturb the ship's course.

But we do not affirm that, at the instant of the resurrec-

tion, there will be any such collection of the original elements that will have composed these bodies, needed. The scriptures call the event which is to take place at that hour, a mystery. "Behold!" says Paul, "I show you a mystery: we shall not all sleep: but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkliug of an eye, at the last trump." Elsewhere, they describe it in this language: "who shall change our vile body, and fashion it like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."[1] This same idea is again expressed by the same pen of inspiration in this form: "who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may become of the like form of his glorious body, according to the energy whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." The scriptures, then, say that the change effected at the instant of the resurrection, is a mystery. It is, therefore, like every other ultimate fact or truth in the universe of God, whether it be in the world of matter or of mind. The scriptures further say, it is accomplished by the "working of God," "by the energy of God, whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." In other words, they assert that it is accomplished by the intervention of the direct agency and power of God.

The assertion, therefore, that the dead, at the resurrection, are represented as coming from where they are not, is a perversion of the language of inspiration, and the exhibition of a captiousness that ill becomes the theme itself, and the course of an honest inquiry.

To affirm further, that it is essential to the resurrection of the body that the original elements, of which it has been composed, should be collected from the four winds of heaven, is to assert what it is impossible to prove; since, if this be essential to a personal identity, there is not a human being on earth that has lived one, ten, or thirty years, who can make any pretensions to an identity of any kind, either personal or

---

[1] Phil. 3: 21.

mental, if in fact there be such a distinction.[1] To affirm, again (in case it be essential to the resurrection of the body that the original substances of which "it has been composed," should be recombined), that there is no power which can accomplish it, is to forget the daily exhibitions of an agency, of a handiwork, of a power in the universe around us, that utterly baffles and confounds the most gifted intellect of earth.

If God be almighty, if he can create at all, if he can bring a single atom of matter from the abyss of nothingness into existence, it must certainly be difficult to set any limits to his power. If he had only to speak, and the confusion of chaos was hushed, and the world itself arose, in all its order and beauty and grandeur, then surely there is nothing impossible in the doctrine that all the millions that now, or shall hereafter, sleep in the dust of death, will spring to life again by the interposition of that same power which hung the earth on nothing in the empty space, kindled up the sun and the

---

[1] There is such a thing as organic identity in distinction from that of the mental or the vital principle, although resulting from the latter. The sameness of chemical composition and peculiarity of form and structure are the essential things that constitute organic identity. This organic identity consists in nothing else than sameness of chemical composition and peculiarity of form and structure. I pretend not, indeed, to describe how that specific and individual identity can be preserved amid the decompositions of the grave. But I do know that the specific characteristics of plants and animals are maintained in this world, under changes perhaps equally great; and when Jehovah declares that so it shall be in the resurrection of the dead, I joyfully acquiesce in the doctrine because I know that Infinite Power can accomplish that which Infinite Wisdom determines. (Dr. Hitchcock, Bibliotheca, April No. 1860.)

We suspect that all efforts to state in what either vegetable or animal identity consists will be a little like those of Locke in the same direction, not very clear or entirely satisfactory.

The same questions as in reference to the Athenian galley that was so often repaired as to leave not a vestige of the original materials of which it was constructed; and, in regard to the stockings that were so darned, will again be raised and agitated as long perhaps as that very grave one which once taxed all the resources of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, viz., whether the hog led the rope or the rope the hog, when the animal itself was conducted to the market.

Identity, either mental, vital, or organic, in whatever it may consist, must be recognized by the mind, perceived, felt, and can hardly be removed, therefore, from the phenomena of our intuitions.

stars, and evoked songs of joy from all the angels of God.

If the world, with all its minute and complicated arrangements, its order, with what we designate its laws, with all the mechanism and grandeur of these heavens that are over our heads, could thus spring into being, and be upheld hitherto by the same power that created, as they must have been, then there is nothing which the Maker of heaven may not accomplish in the fulfilment of his designs. In view of the agency or power that is to be employed in the production of this matchless result, there is certainly in the doctrine itself, no absurdity, no impossibility, nothing that should provoke a question or raise a doubt. If the universe of mind, too, could wake at the touch of this same power; by this same power the spark of immortality be enkindled, and powers of thought and feeling spring into being, that are to burn and glow when suns and worlds shall have passed away; then, no man, at the bar of reason, can be justified who forecloses all argument on this subject with the declaration that the doctrine is itself contradictory, absurd, or impossible. Much less is there in it anything to provoke an Athenian mockery, or inspire contempt. If God, at the first, collected the materials and formed the original pair of each genus and of each species of animals now found on the face of the earth; or if he made them of nothing; if he thus formed the first pair of the human family, so that they came, in perfection, from his hands; if he fixed the conditions or the law by which the successive generations should rise and depart from the world; then, in that very act of creation, are all the wonders and all the mysteries — and no more — which are found in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

To believe in the one and reject the other, is to wage a conflict with reason, and exalt and reverence absurdity.

2. But here another question is raised. What body, it is asked, is meant? What body of the man will be raised at the resurrection? Physiology and chemistry during the present century, have done much in the work of unfolding the principles and laws of our animal economy. As has been

already implied, chemistry by her processes of analysis, has resolved the composition of these earthly tabernacles into fifteen elementary substances, that have, as yet, never been decomposed, and are, therefore, in the language of the science, designated simple substances.[1] These substances are found in every mass of matter that is called man; and at death these substances, by decomposition, are thrown back into their original or simple elements. Death, therefore, is solely a physical change. It implies no mental or moral modification. It is the removal of the tent beneath which the occupant dwells. It is the taking down of the building in which infancy, childhood, and the youth of an existence has been passed, and the departure of the inhabitant to an invisible sphere. Now physiology has revealed to us the fact that these bodies in which we dwell are subject to a perpetual flux, to an unceasing composition and decomposition, to a perpetual decay and renovation. This process goes on, from the hardest bone in the system to the most slender texture: from the cartilagenous substance at the end of our fingers and toes, to the hair on the eyelash and the crowns of our heads. It has become a settled doctrine in physiology, that health depends on the ease or facility with which this process of decay and renovation of composition[2] and decomposition is accomplished; Liebig has shown that in case it be arrested, as it is by arsenic and all the metallic poisons, death is the inevitable result. As a consequence of this law of our physical economy, the particles of matter that in composition constitute these bodies, become often changed in the lapse of time. It is said, an entire change occurs once in seven years. It is, doubtless, much oftener that a complete renovation is effected. A man that has lived seventy years, therefore, according to the authorized supposition, will have changed ten times; so that not one particle of matter, in a

---

[1] See Liebig's, Stockhardt's Chemistries, Carpenter's Physiology. The substances are as follows: Oxygen, Hydrogen, Carbon, Nitrogen, Sulphur, Phosphorus, Chlorine, Lime, Potassium, Sodium, Iron, Magnesium, Manganese, Silicon and Fluorine. See also Hitchcock's Anatomy and Physiology, 1860.

[2] Liebig on Metallic Poisons.

bone or a muscle of his frame is the same with that of his boyhood or manhood, or even with that of the first waning years of his life. And on the supposition that this change is much more frequent, as it may be, the man of seventy years must have at least changed ten times and more, as the case may be. In view of these physiological facts, the question is asked: what body is meant, when it is said, The bodies of men shall be raised at the resurrection? Is it the body of infancy, of childhood, of manhood, or the body of seventy years? Is it the body itself that was committed to the grave? —the pale, worn, wasted, withered, decrepit, and possibly marred, mutilated, ghastly, mangled, and charred body, from which the soul took its exit from life? Is all the matter that has ever been connected with the body of the flesh to be raised? If so, then what masses, in the shape of men, will come up from the antediluvian world? Methuselah, and Noah, and Adam will indeed fill a large space in the world that is to come. Now, on the supposition that the objection here alleged is valid, and constitutes any difficulty at all on the subject before us, then, every person that has lived ten, twenty, or forty years on earth, ought to spurn and reject, at once and forever, the doctrine of his own personal identity. He may say, and ought to say, that he is not the same being that he was five, ten, or twenty years since, or at the period of his childhood; and, with Hume, affirm that he is not the same being that he was last month, or last year, and is, therefore, in no way responsible for any conduct of his past life. If the objection to which we now refer be valid, we may as well be in doubt, to-day, in reference to our personal identity, as to dream that we shall be at that coming period of our existence, when all the dead are to spring up, in a twinkling, from their graves. There is not a man on earth, whatever his age, and whatever the rapidity of this physical flux, this composition and decomposition, who does not know from intuition, that he is identically the same to-day, mentally and personally, with all this decay and renovation, that he was the first bright hour of his life, that has become chroni-

cled on his memory.[1] He knows it, and knows it as one of the revelations of consciousness. You may tell him of your chemistry and physiology as long as Vulcan was falling from heaven; you may look wise, as you discourse to him of nature and nature's laws; become grave and oracular as an Egyptian hierophant; yet the conviction that he is, to-day, one and the same being, mentally and personally, with that of his childhood's recollected dawn, is inseparable from his consciousness. This intuition or conviction, among men, is universal, immediate, and irresistible; and is therefore one of those primary truths, in reference to which no evidence, no human testimony, is ever required. To overlook and deny it, as some of our modern philosophers on the subject of the resurrection have done, is to outrage all the instincts and intuitions of the human mind and commit crime against humanity and against God. The fact of their own personal identity, men cannot disbelieve, if they would. In the same way, at the instant of the resurrection, will every being who shall have lived, of the race of man, be conscious of his own mental and personal identity, notwithstanding all the modifications and changes that will have passed on the body that is then incorruptible, immortal, spiritual, and fitted for the changeless abode of the undying tenant. Now, if any man is uncertain, or perplexed with doubts whether he be the same being that he was fifteen or twenty years since, when he drove a hard bargain, slandered a neighbor, or committed some act of shame, which has never and will never be effaced from the memory, then he will have some good reason to press this question, as it has been habitually urged, by way of an objection. Joseph's brethren, we suppose, were not initiated in modern discoveries. It seems that they had no doubt that they were the same beings in Egypt that they were in Canaan some twenty-five years before, when they put the victim of their hatred and revenge into the pit at Dothan, or sold him to the company of Ishmaelites for a slave. They had not learned this modern philosophy on the subject of the resurrection, and therefore be-

[1] Brown's Mental Philosophy, Chap. VIII.

lieved in their own personal identity. We should not be surprised if some years should yet elapse before the principles of this philosophy should become universal in their application. To-day the conviction, without any argument, and in spite of all that is subtle, plausible, or imposing in any objections that may be raised, is irresistible, immediate, and universal, that we are, both mentally and personally, the same with the earliest recollected period of our existence, and so the conviction must ever remain, amid all the changes of the earthly and spiritual tabernacles, the rush of suns, and the crash of worlds.

3. It is asked, again, what relation has the body that dies to the body of the resurrection? This inquiry or objection (for such it is designed to be) must be based on the assumption that, if there be a relation, we must be able to see it; and, further, if there be no relation, then there can be no resurrection. Now, it would not be at all strange, if there should be to the human mind, even now, many, yea very many, undiscovered relations, in every department of knowledge. Who would have thought, some few score years since, of the relation of the single quality of the elasticity of steam to all the great business operations of the world to-day? Did Dr. Johnson, probably, discover any particular relation between what issued, rather violently sometimes, from the spout of his tea-kettle and the present state of things on this nether sphere? Who would have thought, when the present century began, of the relation of the electric fire to the proclamation of events half round the earth, under ocean and over land, on couriers formed of the lightning's wing? Men once did not see the relation between the power that brings the falling apple or stone to the earth, and that which propels the spheres, moving ceaselessly to the chime of their own music. Every one, now, knows that relations did exist, though unrevealed to the centuries that elapsed before their discovery. The fact, therefore, that a relation is not perceived or become known to any *savant*, does not prove that none exists. No affirmative conclusion, therefore, can be drawn from such a negative premise. There must be a far

more searching induction, and the whole field must be made to give up absolutely all that it contains, of properties or relations, before such a conclusion can rise above contempt. If, on the other hand, it should be admitted that there is no relation between the body that dies and the body of the resurrection, it would not follow, as a matter of course, that there would be no resurrection of the dead. Antecedent to all experience, we should not be able to see the relation between the larva and the chrysalis, or between both of these states and the butterfly sporting his newly-spread pinions in the sunbeams. Antecedent to all experience, there is just as strong a presumption against the acorn's becoming the oak — the monarch which, for a century, breasts all the storms and hurricanes of the hills; the egg, from its nest in the elm, sending forth a messenger to wing its way on the bosom of the air, and pour its sweet songs on human ears; just as strong a presumption against what may be regarded as nothing more than a pebble (instead of an ostrich's egg), in the sands of the desert, becoming a thing of life and speed unmatched by the proudest war-horse and winds, as there is against the fact that all that are in the graves are yet to hear a voice and come forth from the dust with which the mortal part has been, perhaps for centuries, mingled. Antecedent to all experience, there is no process in the physical, intellectual, or moral world, which is not to men improbable and as absurd as the doctrine of the resurrection appeared to be to the Athenians. Creation itself, in all its thousand departments, is, antecedent to all experience, an improbability. Prior to the revelations of science, who could have been made to believe that the globe, on which we tread, wings its way as with the lightning's leap, some six hundred millions of miles in its annual course round the sun, as it does; and moves, all the while, balanced on nothing, too? Antecedent to all experience, is there not, in this way, a presumption to the human mind against every law, change, or mode of action in the universe of God?

And is the presumption against the resurrection of these bodies from the graves in which they will have slept for cen-

turies, any stronger than against every process, law, or mode of action which God adopts in the changes of the physical, intellectual, and moral worlds? If he has power to send this ball of earth six hundred millions of miles through the eternal void around us, every twelvemonth, has he not power to wake the millions of every generation that shall have sunk to sleep in its dust? Suppose that we cannot see any relation between the body that dies and the body that is to be raised in the retributive hour: what then? Does it prove anything at all, except that mankind always have been, and are likely to be, most profoundly ignorant? Who, antecedent to any experience, sees any *relation* between the egg, in its nest among the rocks of some Alpine peak, and the eagle that soars to the sun or plunges and screams through the air? If all the processes in which animal life is propagated on earth are, antecedent to human experience, so improbable, and yet God, in spite of what men call improbability, presumption against it, absurdity, adopts it and acts upon it, without the shadow of a change, as we know he does, who has any right to say that because he can now see no relation between the body that dies and that which is to rise again, that all the dead will not yet stand up in the original, and in the sense before explained — identical forms in which they sunk to their iron slumber? The fact that pope Urban VIII. and his cardinals did not see the relation of the earth to the sun, nor which of these bodies it is that moves in an orbit through the skies, did not exactly annihilate the doctrines of the Copernican system; did not prove that Galileo was a heretic, and that he ought to recant or be burned. All such reasoning is much after the manner of the philosopher of Padua, who affirmed that, as there were only seven metals, seven days in the week, and seven apertures in a man's head, so there could be but seven planets; and when forced to admit the visibility of the satellites of Jupiter by looking through a telescope, he still sagely and profoundly reasoned, that, as they were not visible to the naked eye, therefore they did not exist, and that it would be a mortal sin to believe that they did. From such a negative premise, therefore, as that on

which this objection is alleged to stand, no conclusive inference or even plausible argument can be drawn against the resurrection of the body. The fact that we do not now see relations, cannot prove that they do not exist. If so, all the wonders of modern science should be expunged and razed forever. For, once it would have been thought incredible that there was any relation between the power that brings the apple to the earth, and that which raises the tides of ocean, turns the ten thousand spindles of the palace of industry and toil, wheels the planet in its orbit, and propels the comet in its course. The objection itself, therefore, is and must be baseless, void.

4. Again, it is affirmed that the scriptures do not define the body of the resurrection, so as to impart to men any conception of it, or idea. They are, it is said, so indefinite, vague, or obscure, that nothing can be known, and therefore it is very questionable what they mean to assert when they employ language which is supposed to refer to it. But is there any ground for this objection? It is conceded that, in a physical inquiry, two and only two questions can be raised. In reference to a piece of carbonate of lime, for example, we may inquire: Of what is it composed? And when we are told it consists of oxygen, carbon, and lime, one of these questions is answered. But should we go further and inquire: What is carbon, oxygen, or the substance we designate lime, we reach a limit which has never been scaled. The philosopher lives not who can inform the world what the essence of carbon, of oxygen is, or what is the essence of any simple element of matter. The only reply which he can return here is, that they are simple elements, that they have never been decomposed, and that it is not known that they can be. There are limits to human knowledge and human inquiry which have never been passed — barriers which have never been and will never (whatever progress may yet be made in physical analysis) be scaled. There will — whatever analysis may yet accomplish — be simple elements, elements that will defy all decomposition. In this direction human inquiry ends, and the circumference of the circle that bounds human

knowledge is reached. The human being lives not, who can define or tell what is the essence of the smallest particle of matter which microscopic power brings within the reach of his vision. Now if all this be so, men know absolutely nothing of the fifteen or sixteen simple substances, of which these physical bodies are composed, that we bear about with us from day to day. They know the fact of their existence; but, in spite of all the revelations of science, they really know no more as to what they actually are, than an infant of a day.

The other inquiry that may be made, in reference to the carbonate of lime, is: How it affects other bodies, and how other bodies affect it? In prosecuting this investigation, the properties or qualities of the substance become revealed. And when, in every possible combination, I have ascertained how other bodies affect it, and how it affects other bodies; or, in other words, how it affects and is affected in every possible combination,[1] I have learned all that can be known in reference to it. Now, what is true in the case before us, is true of every physical inquiry that can be instituted under heaven. God, in describing or defining the spiritual body of the resurrection, has not told us what the substance itself, or the essence of this body is. He has said, it was not material: that "flesh and blood could not inherit the kingdom of God." But he has not defined or revealed what the substratum or essence of the spiritual body is, nor given us clew or hint for any discovery. All this is conceded. Nor has he revealed any more the essence, itself, of which these bodies of flesh and blood are composed. No torch of human discovery will ever enter this labyrinth. To human gaze it is forever closed. No searcher of nature's laws, however bold may have been his tread, will ever be able to tell what one of the fifteen original or simple substances is, in its nature or essence, which constitutes the bones, the muscles, the arteries, and blood, of his physical system. Now why should not men object to God's limiting

[1] Brown's Mental Philosophy, Vol. I., Physical Enquiry.

in this way — as he has done — the whole range of human thought, and to his "holding back," here, "the face of his throne, and spreading a cloud upon it?" Why not urge objections here? And if not here, why complain because God has not revealed to us or defined the essence or substratum of the body of the resurrection? Why not complain, also, because he has not revealed or defined to us the substance, nature, or essence, of the tabernacles in which we live, or of matter in any of its thousand forms and combinations? If complaints or objections are pertinent in the one case, they must be also in the other. The truth is — it is as plain as the most palpable demonstration — that there is no ground for objection or difficulty here. God has done all that could be accomplished in the work of revealing or defining the body of the resurrection. To us, limited as we are in the powers with which we are invested, more could not be disclosed. If done, we could not, as we are, comprehend more. More than we now have, therefore, would be to us no revelation at all. God has distinctly defined the body of the resurrection. He has assured us, that it is spiritual, fitted, arranged, adapted for an abode of the immortal mind. He that has assured us that it is the body itself, not the soul, is thus fitted, made, or adapted. The soul is spirit, immortal, without a resurrection; needs none in order that its existence be continued; is not changed, in its nature, by death or by the resurrection. It is the body, therefore, that is raised a spiritual body, and not the soul of man, as has been asserted. It is the body of the dead that is raised incorruptible, indestructible, immortal, arrayed in power, in glory (in the case of the believer in Jesus), like the sun shining in his strength. In the work of describing the body of the resurrection, then, is it possible for the scriptures to accomplish more than they have done for the information of those who are yet to rush, in a twinkling, to the tribunal of the Son of man? Now if there be objections here, on the ground that the scriptures are indistinct or obscure, as is alleged, then we ought to object to the whole universe, of matter and of mind; for, all that we know, or can know, of the original

or simple elements of matter or of mind, is in the form of the qualities or properties revealed. And these, as we have seen, are never known, and never can (in any given case whatsoever) be, in perfection, known.

5. But, it is contended finally, by way of objection to the common or received doctrine of the resurrection, that there is a body or some third thing eliminated, at the death of every man, so that there will be no need of the resurrection of the body from the grave. The soul, as it leaves this dwelling of flesh and blood, wakes in a body that is neither spirit nor matter, but some third thing, upon which neither reason nor revelation has shed any light. In short, there is just as much evidence or proof that, at the death of every man, a kingdom, a throne, and sceptre of power will be eliminated; that *loci laeti et amoena vireta* will be eliminated, as that some third thing, which is neither matter nor spirit, will be evolved from the body the instant the breath departs and the process of dissolution begins. The scriptures, surely, give us no hints of any such transformation; and, on the theme itself, reason is dark as darkness itself. It is theory without proof, assumption without argument. It is a figment of the mind, a dream, and baseless as a night vision. The theory has been broached for the purpose of avoiding the conclusions in reference to the resurrection of the body from the grave, and the scenes of a coming judgment. On such grounds as this theory discloses, men are urged to reject the scripture doctrine of a resurrection of the body, the scenes of the final judgment, and to regard them as the myths and dreams of a pernicious superstition.

Such are the objections, that have recently been vigorously urged against the common or received doctrine of the resurrection. It has been our purpose to state them fully and fairly. The method of reasoning, that has been adopted by the opponents of the doctrine, is to submit their own hypothesis or theory, urge what they designate the philosophical objections or difficulties in the way of assent to the common faith, and then hew, and cut, and square, extend and contract, pervert and modify the passages of the word of God till they fit the Procrus-

tean bed of their hypothesis. It will be impossible, without exceeding the limits here allotted, to pass all these passages in a minute and critical review. We do not deem it necessary to do so for the settlement of the question. The whole subject, so far as the philology of the Christian scriptures is concerned, lies in a very narrow space. The term *ἀνάστασις*, the phrases *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* and *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν*, are the words on which the whole question hinges. The course that has been pursued by the opponents of the received doctrine of the resurrection, in determining the meaning of these phrases, is to infer something from the etymology of the word or words to which reference has been made, affirm what they ought to mean, quote the loose and rickety statements of Dr. Dwight in full, on the meaning of *ἀνάστασις*, and then blink the whole question of the *usus loquendi* of the language itself. There has not been a single principle, rule, or law of interpretation, fairly applied to the language of the scriptures on this subject, by either Prof. Bush or the Rev. Mr. Lee, in their treatises on eschatology. They are, throughout, examples of a perversion of all the rules or laws of interpretation, specimens of etymological sipping, of philological blinking and ignoring. Tacitus says of Galba,[1] "omnium concensu, capax imperii, nisi imperasset." These authors might have been deemed, perhaps, sound and accomplished scholars, had they not written and given to the world their treatises on eschatology.

What, then, is the meaning or import of the term *ἀνάστασις* as used in the scriptures? Any good Greek lexicon will, of course, explain its etymology and some of its significations. It will say, it designates a *rising up, a rising up as from a fall*, a resurrection of the body, a *return to life*: "women received their dead raised to life again," *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως*, Heb. 11 : 35. But the etymological sense, on which it is so convenient for the modern opponents of the doctrine of a resurrection to rely, does not by any means settle its *usus loquendi* and give its import. What did the Athenians, for example,

[1] History, Book I. Chap. 49.

in their market-place and on Mars Hill (Acts 17 : 32), understand to be the meaning of *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, or of the resurrection of the dead? "And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead," it is said, "some mocked, and others said, we will hear thee again concerning this." Did they, for the first time, hear of a future state of existence, on Mars Hill, from the lips of Paul? Was this, to them, a strange doctrine, as they said of his teachings in the market-place? Was this the thing that roused the impatience of an audience the most intelligent and curious, not to say refined, perhaps, of the then known world? Was it this that stirred them to mockery? From the days of Homer, at least, had they not heard of a future state of existence? Was it not taught in his immortal verse, and thus incorporated into the whole texture and web-work of Grecian thought and feeling? Did not Pindar, in lyric strains, bold, grand, and sweet as the honey said to have been hived on his lips, teach the doctrines of a future existence and of future rewards and punishments?[1] Did not Hesiod, and Aeschylus, and Socrates, and Plato? Even their history reveals, in this respect, the power of their convictions. Near the close of the Peloponnesian war, or four hundred and six years before Christ, the Athenians won a great naval victory,[2] over the Lacedemonians and their confederates, at Arginusæ, in which seventy ships of war belonging to the enemy were captured, or sunk in the waters of the Aegean, and thirteen of their own, also, sunk or disabled. In consequence of a storm, that arose immediately after the action, the Athenian commanders were unable to rescue their dead and transmit them to their friends for the rites of burial. By the loss of these rites, it was supposed that the spirits of those who had thus fallen in battle would be compelled to wander, for a century or more, on the shores of the Styx, before they could be admitted to the happy fields or islands of the blessed. Of the ten Athenian commanders, that had charge of that sanguinary conflict, eight were condemned to death

[1] *Vide Olymp.* II. *Theroni Agrigentino curru victori.* Plato's Phaedo.

[2] Vide Lysias oration against Eratosthenes, one of the thirty tyrants of Athens. Xenophon. Hellen. L. I. Chap. 7, et. seq.

for having neglected to rescue (as was alleged) the shipwrecked seamen after the storm, and collect the bodies of those that had been slain or drowned. Six of the eight were executed, and the remaining two banished, by the democracy of Athens, for not doing what was in the power (as was afterward admitted) of no human arm to accomplish. Was the doctrine of a future state of existence, then, either new or strange to an Athenian? Did the hearers of Paul, at this, become impatient and mock? Was it either new or strange, to those who then stood on Mars Hill, that men were to be judged in another world, and receive according to their works? So the Egyptians, from the days of Abraham, so the Greeks, so the Romans, so all the nations that dwelt along the shores of the Mediterranean, from the time the Israelites crossed the Jordan and received the lot of their inheritance, believed not only in a state of future existence, but also in future rewards and punishments. These doctrines are natural, congenial to the very instincts and convictions of the human mind. Their reasonableness is perceived along with the awful consciousness of sin, which pervades the race of man in every nation and age, and perceived, along with the appalling wrongs and outrages that are known to be perpetrated and never to be redressed on earth. Without question, this is the origin of that strong, universal conviction among the first nations of earth, of a judgment to come in that unseen state to which they felt themselves rushing.

What, then, did the assembly on Mars Hill understand by the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, or resurrection of the dead? It was not any doctrine of Plato, of Pindar, or of Homer. If so, it could not have been new. It would not have been strange. The assembly itself would not have been broken up; and in mockery and contempt it would not have indulged. But one answer, under all the circumstances, can be given to this question. It was a return to life, the resurrection of the bodies of men, "at that day when the world is to be judged, in righteousness, by that Man whom God hath before ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

At Corinth, again, not sixty miles distant from the capital of Attica, where the same philosophy and the same learning were cultivated as at Athens, the doctrine was no less new and no less strange. It was no more satisfactory, but was alike repulsive to all their modes of thought and habits of feeling. As the doctrines of Christianity, at Corinth, had found a home in the bosoms of those who had been gathered into the fold of Christ, it was natural that opposition to the strictly revealed doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, should assume an aspect more determined, and enlist all the philosophy and learning, and all the wit and contempt, that could be summoned to the work of exploding a dogma, in the Corinthian view so absurd, and, to the Corinthian heart, so repulsive. The opposition without, it seems, was felt within the enclosure of the church itself; and these who had once received the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead as an article of their faith, and now admitted the fact of the resurrection of Christ, were borne away with the current, and like the scoffing throngs of the rabble, of the philosophers and learned men around them, affirmed that there was no resurrection of the dead. All this is assumed as the basis, or ground work of the discussion in 1 Cor. xv. There is no reasoning in a circle here, as has been asserted. There is no attempt made to prove the doctrine of a future state of existence. Dr. Dwight affirms that the doctrine of a future existence was denied at Corinth; and that Sadducean infidelity had found a lodgment there. For all this, he gives us assertion for proof, and declamation for argument. There is not one particle or scintilla of evidence, that the doctrine of a future state of existence was ever denied at Corinth, or had ever been seriously questioned up to the time that the epistles to the Corinthians were penned. On the contrary, everything in the history, in the philosophy, in the literature and the arts of the then capital of the Grecian world, proves that there was no question in reference to a scene of future existence. The reality of such a state of future existence, was in fact a part of the national feeling and belief, and had been, through all the centuries of their history. Hence the position that is stated

and argued in the 1 Cor. xv., from the beginning to the end of that clear and powerful discussion, and stated and argued in opposition to everything in conflict with it, is the doctrine of a resurrection of the dead. It was the doctrine of the resurrection of the body that was denied, and not that of a future state of existence, as has been so absurdly and pertinaciously affirmed. This view of the case is supported in every part of that sublime discussion, without change or modification. Now if Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead, *ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται*, "I have preached this doctrine," Paul, in effect, affirms; "others have preached it to you; you have received it; you admit that Christ has risen from the dead; the scriptures declared, centuries before his advent in the world, that he would both die, be buried, and rise again. He was seen of Cephas or Peter, after his resurrection; then, of the twelve; afterwards, of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep; then, of James; then of all the apostles; and, last of all, he was seen of me also, as one born out due time. You admit that Christ is risen from the dead: you cannot deny the proof, reject the evidence, or discard the testimony. You allow it to be preached to you, and you receive it as a fact that cannot be denied, as well you may. How say some among you, in the church of Christ at Corinth, then, that there is no resurrection, no general resurrection of the dead?" Such is the logic of this discourse: Paul reasoned from their own admissions in reference to the resurrection of Christ. This was appropriate. To those, to whom the argument was addressed, it must have been satisfactory. Its force, at least by them, must have been felt. It certainly was adapted to this end. There was no reasoning in a circle here, as has been so often affirmed. If Christ had been raised from the dead, then the dead, of course, of all the generations of earth, might be thus raised; yea, would be raised in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. One event was as certain as the other. The power that effected the one, could as easily accomplish the other. If there was to be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ was not risen, as they admitted or believed that

he was. Their faith, on this supposition, was vain. They were unpardoned: they were yet in their sins; all who had fallen asleep in Christ had perished; all who had borne testimony to the resurrection of Christ, and preached a risen as well as a crucified Redeemer, were false witnesses of God, and the condition of believers in Jesus the most pitiable of the race of man. The premise of this argument, therefore, was what the Corinthians themselves believed, in reference to the resurrection of Christ. This they admitted, and yet denied the resurrection of the bodies of men; and, by adopting the interrogative, put their denial in the most positive form. "How are the dead raised up, and with what bodies do they come?" is the language of unbelief, not only in the first, but in every century of our era, on the subject before us. It is impossible, one might well suppose, not to see, here, what was denied at Corinth, and what, in fact, constitutes the subject of the sublime discussion in 1 Cor. xv. It was not the immortality of the soul, or the doctrine of a future state of existence directly; but that of the resurrection of the bodies of men.

The mode of this denial, the form in which the objection is stated, and the reply to it by the great teacher of the Gentiles, settle forever the meaning of *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* in 1 Cor. 15: 12, 13, 21, 42. It is the body that is to be raised incorruptible, not the soul, of man. It is the body, the mortal part, that is to put on immortality; the body, that was weak, that is to become "clothed in power;" the body, dishonored and buried from the sight of men, that is to be arrayed in glory; and the body, that is to become spiritual, as well as incorruptible and immortal. All the race of man that shall ever sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake and live again. For, since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for, as in Adam all die, even so, in Christ, shall all be made alive." As certain as is the event of death, to the race of man, so certain is the resurrection of all the dead of earth's generations.[1] We may safely chal-

[1] It is admitted that there may be Christians whose theoretical views of religious truth, are very defective. The minimum of knowledge, essential to any

lenge the production of an instance, in the whole field of Biblical philology, where the meaning of a word or phrase is so distinctly defined and so unmistakably clear and palpable as in the word *ἀνάστασις*, or the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* in 1 Cor. 15 : 12, 13, 21, 42. It implies a future state of existence, without any question. But its primary and distinctive meaning is the resurrection of the body, that reverts to dust at death. It implies, not only the immortality of the soul, which no Corinthian or Athenian denied, but also the future existence of the body itself. But still its *primary, distinctive* and *positive signification* is the resurrection of all the dead that will have slept, for centuries, in the dust of death. This was denied by Athenian, by Corinthian, and by some, too, who bore the name of Christ in a church gathered under the auspices of the apostle himself.

In this connection it may not be improper to state — what has been so distinctly affirmed, in 1 Cor. xv. in reference to the resurrection of the bodies of the righteous — that the wicked, also, will be raised, at the resurrection of the last day. "They will come forth," says the Saviour, "unto the resurrection of damnation."[1] "As, in Adam, all die; so, in Christ, shall all be made alive." "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake: some, to everlasting life; and some, to shame and everlasting contempt." "All, that are in the graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." "Fear him," says the Saviour, "who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." And have hope to-

---

evangelical faith, it must ever be difficult to determine. But what kind of Christians must those have been at Corinth, who rejected from their articles of religious faith, not only the doctrine of the resurrection of the bodies of men from the grave, but also that of a future state of existence, which lies at the foundation of Christianity itself? If *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* in 1 Cor. 15 designates merely, as Dr. Dwight, Prof. Bush, and the Rev. Mr. Lee affirm, a state of future existence; then, there must have been French infidels in the Church at Corinth, who were addressed by Paul as Christians. Now, what kind of a Christian is he, who believes that death is an eternal sleep? Can anything reveal more distinctly the absurdity of the construction thus put upon *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* in 1 Cor. 15?

[1] John 5 : 29. 1 Cor. 15 : 22. Dan. 12 : 2. John 5 : 28. Matt. 10 : 28. Acts 24 : 15.

ward God which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." It is, therefore, as unequivocally and positively affirmed that the bodies of the wicked, or unjust, will be raised, as it is in the case of those of the righteous. But they will be raised for the accomplishment of a very different end. It will be done for no purposes of good, or of happiness, in respect to themselves. Body and soul, in their case, will be reunited, not for the purposes of bliss and endless glory, but for those of shame and everlasting contempt. They, too, will be raised from the dead incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual, in reference to the bodies with which they will be invested. But it will be that every sight may become appalling, every sound harsh discord, every taste bitter, odor offensive, and touch pain. It will be that every sense of these indestructible tabernacles may become the seat of an anguish that is never to end. They never, in the flesh, employed a single sense or power, a single faculty of body or of mind, in the service of their Maker; and it will be right, therefore, and the inevitable result of the laws of the physical, mental, and moral constitution under which they live, that they should reap the consequences of this abuse of all their powers, in the world to come; in other words, that they should be destroyed, both soul and body, amid those eternal retributions that await those who shall pass their lives without God and hope in the world.

The meaning of the term *ἀνάστασις*, or the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, in the instances cited, cannot be mistaken. They do not signify a future state of existence, except by indirection. They imply it as a result or a consequence. But, primarily and distinctively, they connote or designate the resuscitation, the living again, or resurrection, of the bodies of men that have been dissolved in the dust of death, and a reunion of soul and body, on the part of the dead, that is never to be sundered. It is impossible for us, here, to pass in review the whole forty-two passages, in the New Testament, where the word *ἀνάστασις* may be found, nor will it be necessary to do so for the purpose of settling the *usus loquendi*

of the term or the phrase to which we have referred. In every instance, with two exceptions, it designates a living again, a standing up, a coming forth from the grave, as in the case of Lazarus, of Christ and the saints that came out of their graves after his resurrection. It designates a coming back from the dead: "Women received their dead raised to life again," ἐξ ἀναστάσεως.[1] These exceptions are found in John 11 : 25 and in Luke 2 : 34.

In the first of these passages, Christ says to Martha: "I am the resurrection and the life;" which signifies, of course, that Christ himself — a sweet and blessed truth — is the sole ground or efficient cause of the resurrection, in every case; that it is by his power or his agency, alone, that it is to be effected. It is here a predicate of Christ, and affirms of him a power which, when the time for its manifestation shall have come, will invest him with a glory surpassing that, in view of which the angels of God once shouted, and the morning stars sung. It is in this sense, without any question, that the term is here used.

In the other case, the import of the word is different: "And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary, his mother, 'Behold! this child is set for the fall and rising again, εἰς ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ." In the sense of rising again from the dead, it is not here employed; but is used to designate, in its appropriate and secondary application, a moral or spiritual resurrection — a resurrection from the death of sin. Indeed all the seeming exceptions do, in fact, but confirm and strengthen the primary and distinctive use, meaning, or signification of the phrase which is the subject of our inquiry.

In this connection it will not be inappropriate to refer to the noted passage, Matt. 22 : 31, 32, and to the parallel ones, Mark 12 : 18—27. Luke 20 : 27—38. In the first of these, Christ, in reply to the Sadducees, says: "But, as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you, by God, saying, 'I am the God of Abra-

[1] Heb. 11 : 35.

ham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' God is not a God of the dead, but of the living."[1] The Sadducees admitted the divine authority of the books of Moses. They began their separation from the Pharisees in the days of John Hyrcanus, by rejecting the mass of traditions to which the Pharisees adhered; by limiting themselves to the written word; and, as many suppose, from Josephus (Ant. bk. xii. c. 10), rejecting everything but the writings of Moses. The Saviour, therefore, conducted his argument with the Sadducees, on the basis of their own admissions. As they assented to the divine authority of the great Jewish lawgiver, an appeal to such an authority, in a case in which their feelings and interests were so deeply involved, must have sealed their lips in silence, if it failed of carrying conviction to their minds. It is important, also, to keep in view, here, what the Sadducees disbelieved, or rejected, in the common faith of their religious countrymen. They denied the resurrection of the dead; they denied the existence of angels, and affirmed that there was no such thing as a spirit; while the Pharisees, who were the religious teachers of the age, admitted the reality of each of these propositions. They were, therefore, the French infidels or materialists of their times. And if this is, of itself, a proof of aristocracy and preëminence in anything but sin, then the Sadducees may, in conformity with Mr. Lee's declaration, have constituted the aristocracy in wealth, in learning, and in influence, among the Jews. This is entirely a modern discovery; and its glory, we presume, Mr. Lee will be allowed to share alone. Now the fact is here obvious, at a glance, that the phrase *ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν*, in this passage, is used in its common acceptation; and that it does not here, as has been oftentimes affirmed, designate a future state of existence, except by implication. This is proved, in the first place, from the articles, not of faith, but of disbelief, on the part of Sadducees, which were three in number. They did not believe in a resurrection; they did not believe in the existence

[1] 3:6, 15. At the time this declaration was made, Abraham had been dead 329 years, Isaac 224, and Jacob 198.

of angel, or the existence of spirit. It is, further, obvious that the phrase *ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν* is used in its common or received acceptation, and means, here, a resurrection of the body; as, without bodies, the Sadducees themselves would not have deemed it very important, probably, whether the woman should have a husband or not; or the husbands themselves have wives, in the resurrection. This, as we conceive, must settle the question as to the meaning of the phrase *ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν*, in Matt. 22 : 31, 32, the parallel ones, Mark 12 : 18—27. Luke 20 : 28—38, and Acts 23 : 8. In these passages the phrase does not designate a future state of existence, and could not do so without involving a tautology not found elsewhere in the Christian scriptures. Here, therefore, as in the forty out of the forty-two instances of the occurrence of the term or phrase in the New Testament, its primary, characteristic, and distinctive signification is the resurrection of the body from the dust of death.

Now the Saviour, as has been intimated, conducted his argument with the Sadducees on the basis of their own admissions. They denied the doctrine of a resurrection, of a future state of existence and its retributions; and yet admitted the divine authority of the teachings of Moses. The Saviour, therefore, avails himself of this admission, and quotes the declaration of God to Moses at the burning bush, and lays before them the sublime reality that Moses taught, and distinctly taught, the immortality of the soul of man, and all that was involved in an immortality of being. It may be said, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is only indirectly proved, in the argument of Christ with the Sadducees. But if so, there is nothing in the fact of the method of proof being indirect, that invalidates the proof itself, or renders the demonstration, in the least degree, incomplete. The exact sciences, in instances not a few, resort to the method; and there is never a dream or a suspicion, on this account, of uncertainty or doubt, as to the result of its introduction. The Saviour, in his argument with these Jewish sceptics, asserting, to all intents and purposes, the truth of their own admissions, swept away all the foundations on which they

rested, and of course proved the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead with that of a future state of existence, in this overthrow of the Sadducean faith.

Now unless this term or phrase can be divested of its primary and distinctive import, the modern doctrines that the resurrection takes place at the death of every man, that there is no intermediate state, no general judgment, no end of the world or of the present order and constitution of things, fall, and fall beyond the power of any recovery, unless the scriptures are a fable, and inspiration itself a myth or a dream. On the contrary, if this be its signification, its true and only import, as its *usus loquendi* affirms, almost without change or modification, then there is yet to be a resurrection of the bodies of men : the sea, the caves of ocean, the grave-yards of earth, the valleys, the hill-sides, the rock-ribbed mountains and glens, are yet to give up their dead ; there is an intermediate state ; there is yet to come a righteous and general judgment ; and the scenes of this wretched world of sin, and suffering, and woe, are to have an end. The term *ἀνάστασις*, therefore, or the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, does not mean, and cannot, without a perversion of all the laws of language, be made to designate, simply and only, the immortality of the soul, or a future state of existence, as has been affirmed and reiterated, again and again, by men who profess the profoundest regard for the scriptures of inspiration.

The Biblical history of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, the scriptural proofs of the intermediate state, and the reasons or grounds for a future, general, and righteous judgment, with the objections with which these themes themselves have become recently so much overlaid, cannot be canvassed within the limits of this Article ; and must be left, therefore, for some future discussion.

ARTICLE IV.

DID THE ANCIENT HEBREWS BELIEVE IN THE DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY?

BY REV. S. TUSKA.

THE question whether the Hebrew scriptures contain the doctrine of immortality, has been repeatedly asked and variously answered. While some have roundly asserted that they *teach* this doctrine as clearly as they do the unity of God others (of whom bishop Warburton may be considered the exponent) have run to the other extreme, boldly maintaining that the Old Testament does not contain the least trace of a future state. Others, again, while assuming that the ancient Hebrews had no idea of a future existence of the soul, admit that this idea is indeed *alluded* to in Hebrew scripture, but that these allusions are so obscure that they must have been purposely contrived to conceal the *knowledge* of the doctrine from the Jewish people. (Comp. Whately, Future State, passim.) Still others there are, particularly among the rationalists of Germany, who declare that the idea of immortality is, indeed, clearly expressed in some portions of the Hebrew scriptures, but that these portions are, *for that very reason*, the production of a very late period in the history of the Jews — at a period when these had already learned the doctrine from a *foreign* source.

All these opinions, it will be seen, proceed on the supposition that the ancient Hebrews had *not* the doctrine in question *independent* of their Bible. While, therefore, the one party, in endeavoring to prove that the religion of the ancient Hebrews contained this fundamental principle of all religion, and was thus, in opposition to the view of Kant, a religion *indeed*, are anxious to prove that this principle was expressly *taught* them by their lawgiver and prophets; the other is very zealous in explaining away all such texts as do most clearly allude to the idea of immortality, in order to prove, by the very absence of this idea, the "divine legation" of the

Hebrew legislator. If, however, it can be proved that the ancient Israelites, *even if* the Bible does *not* expressly inculcate it, actually entertained the idea of a future state, neither of the above views need or even *can* be adopted. For, why *teach* a doctrine to a people among whom it is *already* confidently believed? Or why, on the other hand, rigidly exclude it from passages which plainly allude to it, when nothing would be more natural than that such passages should at once suggest the idea of immortality to the mind that has a knowledge of it independently of them.

But how shall this be proved? How can we, without making ourselves liable to the charge of exegetical wrenching and twisting, show that the ancient Hebrews actually believed in a future state? It is not by resorting to those Biblical passages where the idea in question is supposed to be revealed. These, though they tend to *confirm* the argument in the question under consideration, cannot of themselves be considered decisive. For when a man, in order to further a favorite hypothesis, has once persuaded himself that a certain idea is not contained in scripture, he will explain away any and every passage, no matter how clearly it alludes to that idea. And even if he cannot escape the conviction that the scriptures allude to that idea, as e. g. that of a future life, he will, nevertheless, assuming that the Hebrews were destitute of the knowledge of that idea, maintain that those allusions are so obscure as to be unintelligible to any except such as have obtained this idea elsewhere. An ignorant people, it is argued, which has no knowledge at all of a future state, could not derive this idea from a few, scanty, half-concealed allusions to the same; to impress such a people with so important an idea, the latter must needs be clearly expressed and repeatedly inculcated. If, however, it can be proved by other arguments, that the Israelites of old must have believed in the immortality of the soul, then the argument drawn from the exegetical interpretation of the relative passages in scripture will be of so much the more force, as it will not then, in determining the meaning of the text, be necessary to go over the disputed ground again, in order to settle the *general* ques-

tion as to the *existence* of the doctrine among those for whom the Bible was originally composed.

Let us, then, before examining the scriptural allusions to the doctrine of immortality, proceed at once to those arguments which will, of themselves, clearly show that this doctrine was as prevalent a belief among the ancient as among the modern Hebrews. This may be proved:

I. From the universality of the belief;

II. From the residence of the Israelites among the Egyptians;

III. From the traditions derived from the patriarchs;

IV. From the prevalence of certain superstitions; and,

V. From the Hebrew conceptions of the soul.

I. First, then, the *universality* of the belief: God and immortality are the two great pillars on which rests the edifice of all religion. Remove either of them, and the entire structure falls into ruins. As there can be no religion without the belief in the existence of a Being to whom we are to pay religious homage; so, no system or creed which discards the cardinal doctrine of a future state, can be a true religion. For, if I believe that with the dissolution of my body I cease to be a conscious personal being, then I may defy the Omnipotent himself; since, by a single act of mine I could totally annihilate myself, and thus escape the retribution consequent upon deeds however atrocious and corrupt. We accordingly find that, wherever there is *religion*, the belief not only in a divine Being, but also in a future life, exists. These two ideas go hand in hand, accompanying the worshipper to the altar of religion. No nation, however ancient and uncultivated, of whom history has left any record, has been destitute of these two fundamental doctrines of religion. Whithersoever we turn our eyes, whether to the most enlightened nations of antiquity — the Egyptians, Persians, Hindus, Greeks, and Romans, or to the rudest and most savage tribes of Africa and America — everywhere the presentiment of a future life is cherished in the breast of all. Whether this sentiment spring from an instinctive consciousness of human dignity, or from some unaccountable longing for immortality,

this is certain, that the idea of a future state, corrupted and misrepresented though it may have been by popular superstition or false philosophy, has ever afforded consolation to the dying and friends of the dying, even where the mind was in the lowest stage of culture. Nay, more — and this is rather remarkable — the belief in the future existence of the soul is, among many nations, expressed with even more confidence than that in the existence of a God.[1]

Shall we now exclude the ancient Hebrews from the knowledge of this *universal* belief? Shall the children of Israel, whom the Almighty delivered from the despotic sway of the Pharaohs, that they might be unto Him "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," — shall this *favored* people of God form an exception to the rule? To deny that *they* had any idea of immortality, would be placing them lower in the scale of civilization than the most uncivilized nations of whom we have any record; nay, it would be making them incapable, almost, of either thought or feeling. But the children of Israel were not so rude and uncivilized after all. Though they have been commonly represented as a rude, low, ignorant, gross-minded people, as a host of demoralized slaves; yet, is this so far from the truth, as it would be if the future historian of our republic were to say the same of the people of these United States, because forsooth there are a great many enslaved, ignorant, demoralized negroes in the *south*, and not a few brutal fellows in the *north*, as well as in the south. For, a people of that description could never have been brought under such perfect control as was established by Moses; nor could they ever have been induced to accept a religion and code of laws so rational and wise as the Mosaic. There were, to be sure, among them a great many who had been for a long time, even from birth, subjected to the degrading fetters of Egyptian bondage. From such, no doubt, sometimes arose the cry for the "flesh-pots and onions of Egypt."[2] But the great mass of the people was far from

[1] *Schubert, Geschichte d. Seele*, p. 372.

[2] These complaints are expressly attributed to the "mixed multitude" (Num. 11:4), or *rabble* that accompanied the Israelites in the exodus (Ex. 12:38). The former, no doubt, often incited the latter to rebel.

being literally a horde of slaves. Though subject to the tyrannic rule of the Pharaohs, they were personally free, forming a distinct body in the province of Goshen. Here they were engaged in pastoral and agricultural pursuits, the first and fundamental elements of civilization. Besides their division into twelve tribes, which were again subdivided into families and households, each division and subdivision having their respective heads or chiefs; the existence, among them, of a *council of "elders,"* with whom *conjointly* Moses was commanded to appear before Pharaoh,[1] in order to request him to make Israel free and independent; the regular order in which they marched and encamped during their journey in the wilderness; the numerous artists who took part in preparing the various works connected with the sacred tabernacle: all these indicate a high degree of political and social progress, such as could exist only among a people considerably advanced in civilization. Add to this the consideration that there was *not* among the Hebrews, as there was among other nations of antiquity, a caste of priests, who alone possessed the fountains of knowledge, and excluded the people from the light of true enlightenment; but that in *Israel* the sacerdotal order of priests and Levites was instituted to instruct the people in all the wisdom and teachings revealed by lawgiver and prophet, so that the knowledge of a few soon became the property of all;[2] and who will still maintain that the ancient Hebrews had no idea of a future state; that they were, in this respect, below not only their heathen contemporaries, but also the most ignorant tribes of the present day?

II. The improbability — nay, we are justified in saying *impossibility*, of the ancient Hebrews having been ignorant of the doctrine of immortality, is strongly corroborated by the circumstance that they dwelt several centuries in Egypt. The Egyptians, of whom the "the father of history"

[1] Exod. 3: 16—18, comp. 4: 29. See also, the article on the "Representative System of Moses" in this Periodical, Oct. 1858.

[2] Compare Umbreit in his Introduction to the *Proverbs of Solomon*, and Saalschütz, on the *Mosaic Law*, Chap. VIII, and X.

says they were the first who taught the doctrine of a future state, have left unmistakable records and monuments of the existence of this idea among them. A wall-painting in the temple of Isis, at Thebes, represents in symbols the last solemn judgment, according to their ideas. A brief description of this may serve to illustrate how skilfully the ancients expressed their ideas in emblematical delineations. "The dead is conducted, by the goddess Isis, to the supreme judge Osiris. A balance appears, in the tablature, which is accurately adjusted by two hieroglyphical personages, who are no doubt intended to symbolize the scrupulous exactness with which Osiris awards his sentence upon the arraigned mortals. On this scale of equal justice are weighed the good and evil qualities or actions of the deceased, and the result carefully noted down by Hermes or Thoth (the Egytian Mercury), in the presence of Osiris. A priest and priestess intercede with Isis, in behalf of the anxious souls — a beautiful trait of pagan humanity! A lotus-flower, containing four mummy-like figures, composes a part of the scene, and is intended as the symbol of immortality.[1] No one has ever disputed the fact that the ancient Egyptians believed in a future state; and, as appears from the work of Röth,[2] they had this belief even before Jacob and his sons took up their residence in Egypt. Now, even though it be assumed that the Israelites had not, originally, the idea of a life hereafter, they certainly must have become acquainted with it in Egypt; where, as is often asserted, they learned so many other things.

And here it may not be out of place to consider a question which, though it cannot weaken the general argument, has yet an important bearing on our subject. It has been objected, that, if the Hebrews learned the doctrine in question from the Egyptians, they must also have learned that other doctrine so prevalent in Egyyt, and subsequently so strongly inculcated by Pythagoras: the transmigration of souls;[3] and if the

[1] "Descriptions and Antiquities of Egypt," quoted by Goss's Heathen Religion, p. 126.

[2] Röth die ägypt, u. zorvastische Glaubenslehre. *passim.*

[3] Milman, in his Notes on Gibbon (chap. 15, note 57), states this as a reason for the silence of Moses on the doctrine of a future state.

Israelites had adopted this monstrous error, it would have been incumbent on the Hebrew legislator to eradicate a notion so contrary to the spirit of true religion. If then, it is argued, Moses did not, in any passage, guard against the erroneous conception of metempsychosis, it is very likely that the Hebrews did not derive from the Egyptians the idea of a future state at all. But to this it may be simply replied, that it is by no means certain that the belief in the transmigration of souls had, as yet, existed *anywhere* in the time of Moses; nay, there are many circumstances which go to show that *originally* the human mind was satisfied with the bare idea of a life hereafter, and that the doctrine of metempsychosis was foisted upon the people by the subsequent mystic speculations of a caste of priests. The prevalent belief, among the ancients, in the re-appearance of the spirits of the departed — which belief extends back to the remotest periods of antiquity —[1] and the practice of *necromancy*, while showing that the ancients in general believed in a personal, future existence of the soul, are wholly incompatible with the doctrine of metempsychosis. Besides, among the Egyptians, it is well known, the existence of the soul was intimately connected with the preservation of the mummy; and in India, from which country the priests introduced the doctrine of metempsychosis into Egypt, it was customary for the widow to burn herself with the body of her deceased husband, and bury their treasures with the dead, as they hoped to enjoy, in the next world, what they were delighted with in the present.[2] Now, all these notions and customs must needs preclude the idea of a transmigration of the soul into a body that is to exist here on earth, independent of all its former relations; while the continuance of these customs, in spite of the doctrines introduced by a class of mystic speculators, shows that originally the simple idea of a future life, on which the soul entered after the dissolution of the body,

---

[1] Xenophon *Cyrop.* VIII., c. 7. *Meiners Kritische Gesch. d. Religionen*, II., p. 786 seq.

[2] *Meiners*, l. c. II., p. 797.

was alone prevalent.[1] The priests of Egypt, no doubt, like the priestly caste in India, endeavored to supplant the popular idea of a dependence of the soul on the incorruptible mummy, by introducing the principle of a *transmigration* of the soul; but the former was too deeply rooted in the mind of the people to be eradicated by the subsequent teachings of a false philosophy.[2]

III. But though the Israelites must have learned the doctrine of a future state from the Egyptians, if they did not themselves already possess it; yet, it is hardly probable that the Hebrews in Egypt had *not* the idea independent of any foreign source. It is admitted, even by Warburton[3] and Whately,[4] who deny that the Hebrew *people* had any knowledge of immortality, that the *patriarchs* and *prophets* of Israel must have known it by direct revelation from Heaven. We may therefore justly assume that, among others, the patriarch *Jacob* was convinced of the existence of a future state. Now, supposing that the idea was then unknown, is it at all likely that Jacob would have withheld a doctrine so important from the knowledge of his twelve sons? And if *these* once had a knowledge of it, would they not, most naturally, communicate it to *their* offspring? This belief being thus early transmitted from father to son, could not, of course, have become *lost* among a people once possessed of the belief, and living amidst a people entertaining the same belief; for, as history has shown, the idea of a future state is so natural to the human mind, that it is the very last from which a nation, though sunk to the very lowest depth of barbarism, would consent to be divorced.

---

[1] In the same way it might be proved that *Pantheism* among the Hindus arose much later than the idea of Immortality.

[2] This will account for the contradiction of the two ideas — the continuance of the soul in the *incorruptible* mummy, and the transmigration of the soul after the *destruction* of the body. Hence, too, the custom of embalming the dead. That the Israelites themselves did not practise the art of embalming is evident from the fact, that of all the persons whose deaths are recorded in scripture, none were embalmed except Jacob and Joseph; and these were embalmed (in Egypt, of course), only because they were to be transported to Palestine. — See Winer, art. *Einbalsamiren*.

[3] *Divine Legation of Moses*, Vol. V., p. 191. (Ed. London, 1811.)

[4] *Future State*, Sect. I.

IV. But if there be, yet, any doubt as to the probable belief of the ancient Hebrews in the future existence of the soul, it will be entirely dispelled on considering a very popular notion which prevailed among them. It was commonly believed that the dead could, by some magic art, be conjured up and made to foretell the future. So deep-rooted was this superstitious belief among the people, that Moses, in order to eradicate it, found it necessary to affix the penalty of death to the act of necromancy.[1] Still, in spite of this, the severest penalty, the magic craft must have flourished long afterwards; as king Saul found it necessary to put a stop to this idolatrous custom by actually causing all wizards and necromancers to be put to death (1 Sam. xxviii). And yet even Saul, when the Lord refused to answer him by prophet or by Urim and Thummim, is so strangely credulous that he resorts to the only remaining sorceress of the land, who still practised her art in secret, that she may raise for him the prophet Samuel. He even believes that he hears[2] the voice of Samuel, declaring his fatal doom: "To-morrow thou shalt be with me!" Whatever view we may take of this singular phenomenon — whether it be, as some suppose, that God, for some wise purpose, suffered the truth to be foretold by the execrable art of necromancy, or that the witch of Endor, with the skill of a ventriloquist, causing the voice to proceed from the spot where Saul supposed Samuel to stand, made a happy guess[3] — this instance is sufficient to illustrate how deeply rooted this strange infatuation was among the people. Now, if it was generally believed that the departed

[1] Lev. xx., 27.

[2] Saul only *hears* Samuel, but does not see him. He only knows that it is Samuel from the *description* given of him by the witch of Endor. This representation in the text, seems to favor the view of the ancient Jewish Commentators, that the sorceress practised *ventriloquism* while pretending not to hear the voice herself.

[3] That she should have *guessed* merely, and yet predicted a doom so fatal (when, for aught *she* knew, Saul might have remained alive), may be accounted for by the supposition that she *purposely* did so, in revenge for his having put to death those who practised necromancy; thinking, that one who seriously consulted her and put so much faith in her art, would lose all courage on the battle-field, and die.

could rise from their graves and foretell the events of the future, does not this belief necessarily proceed on the anterior belief that the spirits of the departed *continue* to exist *personally conscious* of the future as well as the past? How else could we account for the practice of necromancy and the general desire to consult with the spirits of the dead?

Strange as it may seem, Warburton himself admits this conclusion; and that, too, in the very work in which he declares that the Jews had not even the idea of a future state, from the time of Moses down to the Babylonian captivity. In refuting the view of lord Bolingbroke, who thought that possibly Moses himself knew nothing about immortality, he says: "the prohibition of necromancy, or the invocation of the dead, *necessarily implies*, in the lawgiver who forbids it, as well as in the offender who uses it, *the knowledge of a future state.*"[1] The learned bishop does not, indeed, say that the *people* who superstitiously put faith in the deceitful art of the necromancer, must have had this knowledge; that would have been too glaring a contradiction of his other statements respecting *their* ignorance of a future state. But are not the *people* equally well implied in the above? Were not the "offenders" members of the people? And if the *practice* of the necromancy necessarily proceeded on the idea of a future existence of the soul, must not the people, who consulted the necromancer, desiring him to conjure up some deceased friend that they might converse with him, have been persuaded of the very same idea? The distinguished divine, in allowing the lawgiver and the offender to have had a knowledge of a future state, was not aware that his argument proved (for him, at least) too much, himself testifying, though *undesignedly*, to the *people's* having the same knowledge.

V. The idea of immortality is so intimately connected with the conception a man has of the nature of the *soul*, that by ascertaining the conceptions which a people form of the latter, we may readily infer their ideas respecting its future

---

[1] Divine Legation, Vol. V., Appendix, p. 205.

existence. The materialist, who supposes the soul to oe nothing more than the product of the bodily mechanism put in motion — that it is the mere circulation of the blood — does not, nay *cannot*, believe in immortality. On the other hand, he who believes that the soul is something wholly distinct from, and antagonistic to, the body, and that the former only *departs* at the dissolution of the latter; such a man, we might well presume, believes in the future existence of the soul apart and separate from its previous habitation of clay. Now, the ancient Hebrews, as is admitted even by the distinguished critic De Wette,[1] had as lofty and sublime a conception of the human soul, as is to be found among the most enlightened nations of our day. In the very first chapter of Genesis, they were taught that man was made in the *image of God.* They were, further, taught that man was made of the dust of the earth, and became a living soul, after the "breath of life" was breathed into his nostrils by the Creator (Gen. 2:7). Here, then, was a *dualism.* The Israelite, on reading such a passage, must have at once inferred that man was composed of two things totally distinct from each other, as the one was anterior (as well as *inferior*) to the other. What, now, did the ancient Israelite understand when he was told that man was made in the image of God? Was it the lifeless body, that was made "after the likeness" of God? Of course not. Was it the *living* body — the *body* vitalized by the "breath of life" — which reflected the image of the Lord? This, too, could not have been the case. For the Lord, he is repeatedly admonished, has no form or shape whatever; hence no material *body*, however gross or ethereal, can be said to be made "after the likeness" of God. God, then, being an *invisible, spiritual* Being, must have been reflected in that invisible, spiritual part of man — the *soul. This* was the image of God; through this, man was made after *his* likeness. On hearing, therefore, such a passage as, "dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return," the Hebrews could not but refer this to the *body*, and not to the spiritual element in man, the image

[1] Biblische Dogmatik, p. 90.

of God. This, which was *not* made of the dust of the ground, must needs have another destiny. The dissolution of the body must have suggested to the early Hebrews the thought, afterward so clearly expressed by the author of Ecclesiastes (12:7), that while "the dust [the body] returns to the earth as it was, the *spirit* returns unto God, who gave it."

But, it is objected,[1] how could the ancient Hebrews have had any idea of immortality, when they knew not the essential distinction between matter and spirit; the idea of a substance devoid of form or matter, being entirely foreign to them and nowhere revealed in the Bible? Whatever has form is material, and consists of parts; and must therefore, like all matter, be dissolvable and perishable. How, then, could the man, who ascribed a certain form (no matter how vague) to the soul, believe in its endless existence? It is rather strange that a mind so acute and well-read as that of Bretschneider, should consider the absence of the idea of *immateriality* as positive proof for the non-existence of the idea of *immortality.* Admitting that to the philosopher the metaphysical idea of an *immaterial* substance is necessary to prove its immortality — even though Locke is of the opinion that it is *not* necessary[2] — we would simply reply to this objection that, in view of the arguments already presented, it can only convict the ancient Hebrew of an inconsistency, of which he was no doubt unconscious; but which did not, in the least, shake *his* confidence in a future state. The *fact* of his entertaining a certain idea, cannot be denied by proving his belief of a certain other idea, however erroneous and (to the strictly logical metaphysician) contradictory of the former. But if this objection is nevertheless designed to prove that the *Hebrews*, because they had no idea of immateriality, could not have had a knowledge of immortality, it would also prove that *all* mankind, the early *Christians* included, had not the idea of an immortal life. Thus the heathen philosophers, who expressly inculcated that the soul is immortal, ascribed

---

[1] Bretschneider Dogmatik, II., p. 363.

[2] Essay on the Human Understanding, pp. 349 and 362, seq.

to it the human form, and regarded it as a subtle ether; which, of course, is only a refined form of matter.[1] All the Platonists were of the opinion that the soul is endowed with a celestial body on its descent into the concrete body of flesh and blood; and that, on its departure from this earth, it retains the same celestial body.[2] Most of the Fathers, in the first ages of Christianity, though firmly convinced of the immortality of the soul, maintained that the privilege of living and acting *without* a body, belongs to God alone.[3] Some of the Christian Fathers do, indeed, designate the soul by the term *spirit.* But this spirit they took to be a refined kind of body, such as aerial or ethereal.[4] The Jewish sect of the Essenes also, according to Josephus, believed "that the bodies are perishable; but that the souls are immortal and everlasting, and come from *the most subtle ether* into connection with the body."[5] If, now, we are to judge from our own conviction of the perishableness of whatever is not wholly *im*material, then we must deny to all these the belief in immortality; because from *our* point of view, the latter is incompatible with the belief that the soul is a body, however ethereal or celestial. Still, most of the ancients, to whom the metaphysical idea of a substance having neither form nor body was unknown, though convinced of the perishable nature of all gross matter, nevertheless regarded *some* things, particularly bodies of an ethereal nature, as indivisible, incorruptible, and even of the same nature as God himself. Now, in regard to the Israelites, even though they could not conceive of anything without investing it with some peculiar

[1] See Mosheim's Note to Cudworth's Intellectual System, Vol III., p. 293. London edition.

[2] Cudworth, *ibid.* III., pp. 260 and 299.

[3] Ibid. p. 319.

[4] Mosheim on Cudworth (*ib.* p. 325). This is more fully illustrated in the case of Irenaeus (*ibid.* p. 327 seq.) The Christian Fathers, too, sometimes apply the term *incorporeal* to the soul. But this word is used by most of them, not in the metaphysical sense of our day, but only *comparatively*, as opposed to the *gross body*. *Ibid.* p. 353. Origen, in support of his theory that God alone can act without a body, cites the case of Samuel and Lazarus, whom scripture represents *with* bodies in the future state. *Ibid.* p. 319.

[5] Bell. Jud. II., c. 8, § 2.

form — and indeed it is impossible for *any* man to form a *conception* of a thing without attaching to it some more or less defined form — they must, nevertheless, have known that the soul, whatever its real essence, is something *distinct* from the body surrendered to the grave. They knew, as well as we do, that this body is but a temporal habitation of clay, while the soul is the *breath of God*, "breathed into" man, to make him *like* unto God; that the former alone returns to the dust as it was, while that which is *not* body — the *spirit* — is imperishable, returning unto him who made man "in his image."[1]

To suppose, therefore, that the ancient Hebrews, who believed that God is an invisible, eternal Being; who were taught that man was made in the image of God, the "Father of all spirits;" to suppose that a people possessed of such noble conceptions respecting God and man, had not the idea of immortality, is to place them, not only beneath the rank of all their heathen contemporaries, but also far below some of the most savage and ignorant tribes of the present day; nay, it is to make them discard an idea which they must have either received from their ancestors, or met with in the land of the Egyptians; nay more, such a supposition would make the people consult the wizard and the sorceress to raise for them those who had departed to another, a future state, though they had no idea of a future state at all! No, it would be impossible to account for so strange a phenomenon. For, while each one of the arguments above presented, taken by itself, renders it highly improbable that the ancient Hebrews had *not* the idea of immortality, the several arguments combined must needs produce the strongest conviction that the favored people of the Lord actually *had* that idea.[2]

---

[1] The ancient Rabbins, contrasting the microcosm of man with the macrocosm of God, have expressly enumerated the principal qualities in which the soul is *similar* to God. Their words, which may be of interest, are as follows: "As God fills the whole universe, so the soul fills the whole body; as God sees, but is himself invisible, so the soul; as God nourishes and supports the entire Universe, so the soul nourishes and supports the entire body; as God is pure, so is the soul." Talmud Berachoth, 10, a.

[2] The general belief in the existence of *angels* must have greatly contributed

II.

We are now prepared to answer the question, whether the Hebrew *scriptures* contain any allusions to the doctrine of a Future State; and whether these allusions are so clear as to be intelligible to the ancient Hebrews. If this is the case, then the latter not only *believed* in, but (contrary to the opinion of Whately[1]) actually had a *knowledge* of a life hereafter. For if, as the learned Archbishop says, the testimony of Revelation is sufficient, in lieu of "rational" grounds, to produce a *conviction* of the truth in the mind of the *believer*, then the ancient Hebrews, as will soon appear, must have been firmly *convinced* of the doctrine in question. Now, in order to produce this conviction, the Bible need not, as many assume, *teach* and repeatedly inculcate the doctrine of Immortality,—for why do this when the doctrine is already too well known,—but simply *allude* to it. For even "slight incidental hints," says Whately himself,[2] "and oblique allusions have often more weight than distinct formal assertions."

Now, these allusions, in the very first and oldest book of the Bible, are so numerous and clear, that, in view of the arguments already presented, they furnish an additional *proof* that the ancient Hebrews had a knowledge of the doctrine. Take, for example, the oft-quoted instance of the translation of Enoch. A good man, walking in the fear of the Lord, disappears, "for," says the sacred historian, "God took him." Now, on reading such a passage, the mind naturally inquires: Why did God take so good a man away from the earth? Was it not in order to reward him? And if God did not reward him here on earth, he must have re-

---

to strengthen their belief in this idea. The conception of an angelic being, devoid of a body of flesh and blood, capable of appearing and vanishing in rapid succession, of flying to the utermost parts of heaven and earth — the universe of the ancients — must have enabled unprejudiced minds to form at least some vague conception of their own future spiritual existence.

[1] Future State, Sec. I.; comp. his *Essays* (first series).

[2] Rhetoric, Part I., Chap. 2. § 4.

warded him in a sphere beyond this earth. But what *was* this reward? Surely not annihilation? The human mind has a natural horror of such a thought, and would rather consider it as a punishment than a reward. Besides, the most wicked man would, in that case, be able to "reward" himself at any suitable moment. No, if the good man Enoch was taken away by God, he must have been transferred to a higher, a *celestial* abode, there to reap the reward for his upright conduct on earth. This thought, no doubt, consoled the people for his early departure from his terrestrial home. So, too, Paul[1] understood the passage under consideration; and the ancient Chaldee version of Jonathan paraphrases it as follows: "For Enoch died and was transferred to heaven."

Bishop Warburton, in reference to this passage, admits that "Moses knew and believed the immortality of Enoch," but purposely obscured the fact from whence it might have been drawn.[2] Let the candid, unprejudiced inquirer say, if there is any obscurity in the narration. Is not the story of Enoch's translation told in as clear a manner as any other fact in the Bible? And can it be that the ancient Hebrews who, as we have already seen, were not altogether so ignorant and gross-minded as has been generally assumed, and, what is more to the point, actually had the idea of a future state, did not understand an allusion so clear? The pious Israelite who, under the Mosaic dispensation, saw himself rewarded with manifold blessings in *this* life, looked upon death as the *continuation* of a happy, though higher and spiritual, life. Says Herder: "The expressions 'God took him to himself,' 'God took him to his own dwelling-place,' became afterwards the expressive phrase to denote the fate in the other world of those who were the favored of God; and without doubt the notion was derived from this most ancient friend of God. . . . . This translation of Enoch, instructive as it was, came at once to be also a matter of

---

[1] Hebrews 11 : 5.

[2] Divine Legation, Book V., Sec. 5.

peculiar interest, and full of hope, as prefiguring the like removal to himself of other friends of God." [1]

From this conception of the blessed state of the friends of God in another world, early arose those beautiful expressions used to express the departure of the righteous from this world. נאסף אל־עמיו, "He was gathered unto his people," is the expressive phrase describing the death of the three great Patriarchs, and Moses and Aaron.[2] Some have supposed that this favorite expression means nothing more than the depositing of the dead body in the family tomb; but the connection in which it stands does not admit of such a supposition. Thus, Abraham "was gathered to his *people*," though buried beside the *solitary* tomb of his wife, Sarah (Gen. 25 : 8, 9). Moses and Aaron certainly were not buried in a "*family* tomb." Besides, the act of burial is generally described by a special phrase, and rendered wholly distinct from the being gathered to one's people. Thus we are told that Jacob "yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people;" but it was not until "three score days and ten" of mourning had passed, that he was carried into the land of Canaan to be *buried* in the cave of Machpelah. Jacob himself rendered the distinction between the two ideas (the burial and the gathering) prominent, when shortly before his death he charged his sons, saying: "I am about to be *gathered* unto my *people; bury* me with my *fathers* (Abraham and Isaac) in the cave that is in the field of Ephron the Hittite" (Gen. 49 : 29, 31). Compare, also, Gen. 25 : 8, 9, and 35 : 29, where Abraham and Isaac are respectively said to be buried *after* they are gathered unto their people.[3] It

[1] Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, Vol. I., pp. 177–8 (Eng. Trans.). Herder goes on to state (*Ibid*) that this expression was so understood by the kindred nations of the east. "The Arabians have a multitude of fables representing the wise, the innocent, the lonely, the zealous, the prophetic, the persecuted and despised Idris (so they call Enoch), whom God received into heaven, and who dwells in Paradise."

[2] Gen. 25 : 8, 9; 35 : 29; 49 : 29—33. Num. 20 : 24. Deut. 32 : 50.

[3] In his comment on the passage: "Thou shalt go to thy *fathers* in peace" (which God said to Abraham, Gen 15 : 15), Rashi, the most *popular* Jewish commentator, naively remarks that from these words we may learn that Terah (the father of Abraham), must have forsaken his idols and repented, so that there could be a union of spirits between him and Abraham in the other world.

is needless to dwell any longer on the meaning of this national, standing expression. Christian as well as Jewish commentators are united in their opinion, that this expression has reference to a gathering *beyond* the grave. Even Warburton[1] is "ready to allow that this phrase *originally* arose (whatever people employed it) from the notion of some common receptacle of souls;" adding, however, that it subsequently *lost* its meaning among the Hebrews; but the sense which was originally attached to this phrase could only have been lost among a people that had no *idea* of immortality. The Israelites, however, as has been shown, *did* have this idea; and, hence, must have continued to use those words in the same sense in which they were *originally* employed.

In the forty-seventh chapter of Genesis, also, there is an intimation of that conception, so common among the Oriental nations, which represents this life as a state of preparation for another. Jacob, being asked by Pharaoh his age, answers in a manner which at once reveals the long train of suffering through which he had passed, and for which he hoped to enter into a state of uninterrupted joy and endless bliss. "The years of my *pilgrimage*," says the aged patriarch, "are an hundred and thirty. Few and full of sorrow have been the days of my life; and they have not attained to the years of the life of my fathers in the days of *their pilgrimage*" (47:9). Jacob here compares life to the state of a pilgrim, looking for a farther and better country. His reply to Pharaoh's question is the more pertinently expressed when we consider that he addressed it to a king of the *Egyptians;* who, as Diodorus (I. c. 51) tells us, regarded the present habitations of men as "inns" (καταλύσεις), in which they get ready for a state of immortality. Heraclitus, also, regarded the soul as having taken lodgings in the body like a stranger or guest.[2] The idea that man is a stranger on earth, looking for another home, runs through the later portions of scripture,[3] and must have been very popular among

[1] *Ibid.* Bk. VI. Sec. 3. [2] Schubert, Gesch. d. Seele, p. 369.
[3] Comp. Psalms 39:14; 119:54. 1 Chron. 29:15.

the Jews when the Rabbinical sages of the *Mishna*[1] made a practical application of the same in saying: "This world is like a vestibule to the future world; make thyself ready, therefore, in the vestibule, that thou mayest enter the *palace*." In the same sense the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews must have understood the passage under consideration, when speaking of the patriarchs, he says, that those who declare "that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth," "*plainly* declare" that they are in quest of a "*better* country" (Heb. 11 : 13–16). It is rather strange that an orthodox divine of the Anglican church, as Bishop Warburton was, should, in the very teeth of this, maintain that the words of Jacob "express no such thing."[2]

These few passages from the *Pentateuch* are sufficient to show that the doctrine of immortality is contained in the *Bible* — the former being the oldest constituent part of the latter. They, at the same time, strongly corroborate the argument for the existence of the doctrine among the ancient Hebrews. The Pentateuch being read and expounded to the Hebrews ever since the time of its composition (Deut. 31 : 9–13), even unto this day, such allusions to a future state must have remained ever fresh in their minds, and greatly assured them of their belief. It would, therefore, not be necessary to examine the several passages, alluding in terms more or less clear to a future life, in the *other* books of the Hebrew scriptures. But as those who maintain that the Hebrews had no idea of immortality, assert that the Hebrew Bible not only does not allude to, but that some books, as the Psalms, Job, and Ecclesiastes, even *deny* or *doubt* the doctrine, it may be proper in this place inquire into the justness of this assertion respecting these very books. Before proceeding, however, to examine the several passages in question, we may be permitted, in passing, to remark, that if it be true that David, or Job, or the author of Ecclesiastes, denies or doubts the doctrine of immortality, this very denial or doubt is proof that the Hebrews, or

[1] Pirke Aboth ("Ethics of the Fathers") IV., 16.

[2] Divine Legation, Bk. VI. Sec. 3.

at least the great majority of them, *believed* in the doctrine. For who would ever think of denying a doctrine of which everybody is ignorant? What occasion is there for doubting the truth of belief, unless that belief is a very *popular* one? Those, therefore, who would, from the denial of a few, prove the disbelief or ignorance of the many, are so far from proving this, that their assertion, if true even, proves the contrary. Were there no *positive* evidence of the fact, that the *people* actually believed in a future state, the negation of the same by a *few* would be evidence enough, though negative in its nature.

But there is no book of the Old Testament that denies or even ignores the doctrine of a future state; and least of all is this true, as has been asserted of the Psalms, the books of Job and Ecclesiastes. In regard to the Psalms, a mere superficial reading of the 16th, 17th, 49th, and 73d will at once show that the inspired singers of them were fully convinced of a life hereafter. In his commentary to the 17th Psalm, De Wette says, that David, notwithstanding the heading, could not have been the author of it. And why? Because it *clearly expresses the hope of immortality.* Thus, a German critic is obliged to admit that the Psalm *does* allude to a future life, though, according to his theory, he must deprive David of the honor of having composed it. As if the inspired singer of Israel, who, when his little child was no more, consoled himself with the happy thought: "I will go to him, but he will not return to me" (2 Samuel 12 : 23), were incapable of entertaining so blissful a hope, though living in the midst of a people where this hope generally prevailed! The 49th Psalm even *proves* the doctrine of a future state by the most satisfactory of all arguments — the argument based on an Infinite, All-just Governor of the universe. It solves the great enigma of life — the prosperity of the wicked and the afflictions of the righteous in this world. This perplexing problem can only be solved by assuming a retribution *hereafter*; and such a solution is presented in this Psalm, as will appear from the following brief analysis of the same. The Psalmist opens with a solemn

call to all the inhabitants of the earth to listen to a lesson of divine wisdom. He observes that the wicked are mighty and rich (v. 7) even unto death, when they bequeath their power and wealth to their posterity (v. 10). Nay, they even die with the expectation that their name and works will continue to live. The Psalmist admits, indeed, that they cannot take their treasures along with themselves; but, then, the righteous too must die, and are unable to take with them the remnants of earthly prosperity, particularly as their terrestrial career was not attended with splendor at all (vs. 6–10). The just and the unjust, therefore, are, *in so far*, on an equal footing. When, then, shall the unjust be punished for their wickedness? After death, of course. They sink into the under-world (Sheöl) like stupid beasts (v. 14), possessing none of that wisdom which adorns the righteous in the future world (vs. 19, 20). The want of wisdom and light being here regarded as a punishment, it must be that the *fulness* thereof is a reward; and it must be in this that "the righteous will have dominion" over the wicked, as was already said in verse 14. Though the good man be persecuted all his days, and the wicked prosper even unto death, nevertheless, the Psalmist assures us, the former will triumph over the latter. Now, this triumph cannot take place as long as the wicked man *lives;* for he lives prosperous *to the end.* How, then, shall the righteous man triumph over him? Shall it be, as some suppose, by his *surviving* the wicked? Shall he, after seeing the latter prosper to the end of their days, console himself with a few years' prosperity for a life of misfortune? A poor consolation, indeed! Besides, what if the good man dies before the wicked, and that, too, as may often happen, at the hands of the latter? This triumph and dominion of the good, then, must needs begin in another world, just as the dismay and the misery of the wicked are represented by the Psalmist as commencing *after* death. While the latter, in the hour of dissolution, goes down like a senseless brute, bereft of all earthly riches and glory (v. 17), the former will be redeemed from the power of *Sheöl* (here the under-world of darkness and

shame); for the Lord will receive them into his own glorious presence. The thought which consoled the people at the early departure of Enoch of old, is also the consolation of the righteous in this Psalm.[1]

But, it is said, there are several passages in the Psalms, which, if they do not point-blank deny, wholly ignore, the doctrine of immortality. Thus, Warburton[2] cites the following passages as plainly indicating that the Jewish people had no expectation of a future state: "In death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks" (Ps. 6 : 6)? "What profit is there in my blood when I go down into the pit? shall the dust praise thee? shall it declare thy truth" (Ps. 30 : 10)? "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in destruction? shall thy wonders be known in the dark, and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness" (Ps. 88 : 11–13)? Lastly, in the 115th Psalm (v. 17), "The dead praise not the Lord, neither they that go down into silence."

Now, who does not at once see that in all these the Psalmist contrasts death and the grave with life on earth? To conclude from such passages that the Hebrews had no idea of a future state, is as rash and unfair as it would be to infer from the many pious effusions of our day respecting the brevity of life, the silence of the tomb, the dark, lonesome habitations of the dead, that *we* are destitute of the knowledge of immortality. The Psalms containing these passages have been early incorporated with the Jewish liturgy, and some of these very passages are contained in the "order of burial" according to the Episcopalians. Shall we, therefore, be justified in saying that these, as well as

[1] In the analysis of this Psalm we have principally followed the thorough, critical exposition given by Dr. Saalschütz in his elaborate Article on *Immortality* (see Illgen's Zeitschrift f. hist. Theologie, 1837). In this able Article will be found a full exegesis of all the passages alluding to a future state both in the scriptures and apocryphal writings of the Hebrews. For many of the ideas contained in the present Article, we are also indebted to Saalschütz.

[2] *Ibid.* Bk. V. § 5.

the Jews, who have from times immemorial chanted those Psalms in their synagogues, have never had, nor have now, the knowledge of a future life?

It should be remembered that in all these passages the poet confines his thoughts to the corpse resting in the tomb. It is the *body of clay* which cannot declare the loving kindness and faithfulness of God. It is the *dust* that cannot praise the Lord. Are such utterances at all incompatible with the strongest convictions of immortality? Besides, where is it that the dead are said to be unable to do what the living perform on earth? It is in the dark, silent, solitary *tomb*. It is the *grave* where all things are forgotten. Warburton himself tells us in another part of his work,[1] that it is "the *grave*" which "is represented as the land of darkness, silence, and forgetfulness."

This, too, will account for those remarkable words of Hezekiah, when, in his song of thanksgiving for his wonderful recovery from sickness, forgetful of everything else in his exceeding joy at being still able to rule on earth, he exclaims: "The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit do not hope for thy truth. *The living, the living*, he shall praise thee, as I do this day."[2] He who supposes that a man, in the vigor of life, recovering from a disease that had almost proved fatal, would be inspired with *different* sentiments, has mistaken human nature. When a man is ardently longing to make himself useful to the world around him, and while engaged in the prosecution of a noble undertaking, is stretched on the bed of sickness, would he not, like Hezekiah, pray for a continuance of his career on earth? "I will not die, but live," says the Psalmist, "that I may proclaim the works of the Lord." Man was born to make himself useful to his fellow creatures; and, in order to do so, it is his *duty* even to pray for *life*, until the heavenly Father deems it fit to remove him from his terrestrial sphere of usefulness.

In the Book of Job the passages which have been com-

[1] *Ibid.* Vol. V., p. 181. London edition 1811. [2] Isaiah 38:18, 19.

monly supposed to deny the doctrine of immortality, are more striking at first sight. But, before examining these, we cannot refrain from remarking, that it would be strange indeed, if a man who so repeatedly asserts his innocence, and maintains, in opposition to his friends, that prosperity does not by any means always accompany the virtuous in this life, but that the vicious are often more prosperous than the former; who, in spite of the heavy afflictions which leave him no hope of returning prosperity in this world, resigns himself to God and prays him to put an end to his sufferings here on earth, — it would be strange, indeed, if such a man, under such circumstances, did not console himself with the thought of a *future* justification.[1] What does Job refer to when he wishes that his sentiments "were graven with an iron stile, and lead in the rock forever" —

> "I know that my Redeemer lives,
> and in after-time will stand upon the dust;
> and *after* this my skin is destroyed
> and *without* my flesh shall I see God;
> Whom I, for myself, shall see
> and *my* eyes behold, and not another,
> when my reins are consumed within me."[2]

Can the hope of a future life be expressed in language more explicit? Does not Job here rejoice in the expectation of that *spiritual* contemplation of the divine glory, — a boon which even Moses desired, but could not obtain in this life, because no man can see God and live,[3] which is reserved for the righteous in their future *celestial* abode?

The ablest interpreters of the book in question agree in the opinion that Job here expresses his hope of a future life; and yet it has been objected that he could not have had a knowledge of that life, because he himself, in several

[1] The question respecting the time when, and the author by whom, the book was written, is of little moment in the present consideration; still less the question as to whether Job was a real or fictitious person.

[2] 19 : 25—27. We have followed, in this and in the following passages from Job, the excellent version of Dr. Conant.

[3] Exod. 33 : 20.

places, declares that there is no return from the dead. The passages referred to are the following:

> "My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle,
> and consume away without hope.
> Remember that my life is a breath;
> my eye shall not again see God.
> The eye of him that seeth me shall behold me no more;
> thine eyes will seek me, but I shall be no more. — 7 : 6–8.

Again:

> "Man, of woman born,
> is of few days and full of trouble.
> Like a flower he goes forth and is cut off;
> he fleeth as the shadow, and abideth not.
> * * * *
> For there is hope for the tree,
> if it be cut down, that it will flourish again,
> and that its sprout will not fail.
> Though its root become old in the earth,
> through the scent of water it will bud,
> and put forth boughs like a sapling.
> But man dies and wastes away;
> yea, man expires, and where is he?
> Waters fail from the pool,
> and the stream decays and dries up:
> so man lies down, and will not arise;
> till the heavens are no more, they will not awake
> nor be roused from their sleep." — 14 : 1, *seq.*

Now, what is to be inferred from all this? That Job denies the possibility of a future existence? By no means. He merely gives up, in despair, all thought of enjoying once more the good things of *this earth*. He will no more be able to occupy the place of his former blessed condition. He must depart, and leave his place to be occupied by others. He himself tells us, in a similar strain, what he means by a return from the dead:

> "The cloud consumes away and is gone;
> So he that goes down to the under-world, shall not come up.
> *He shall not return again to his house,*
> and his place shall know him no more." — 7 : 9, 10.

Job here plainly refers to a renewal of life *on earth;* and "What soul," says Herder,[1] "after death, has ever returned to enjoy the blessings of the earth?"

But why, it may be asked, if Job had a knowledge of a future state, did he not once for all silence his opponents (who insisted that no misfortune could overwhelm the righteous in this world) by showing them that his reward was reserved for a future existence? Would not this belief have been a constant solace in his present sufferings? But, in the language of Dr. Conant, in his Commentary to Job,[2] "a solace for present evils for some future good was not the thing which Job sought, or which his case required. It was a solution of the mystery of God's dealing with him, and with other righteous men in this world. Why should God treat, as he does his enemies, one who loves him, confides in him, and still seeks refuge and help in him (16 : 19)? This question (if the voice of suffering nature is not misrepresented) still rises in many a dark hour of inward conflict; and it calls for just the answer given to Job."[3]

Nor was the doctrine of a future state designed to refute the cavils of the three friends of Job. For, though the innocent man, such as Job is represented to be, feels confident that he will enjoy blessings hereafter, that will infinitely more than compensate for present afflictions, yet this hope does not *explain* the mysterious conduct of an ill-wise Governor. The design of the Book of Job, as is evident from the final interposition of the Omnipotent himself, is to vindicate the government of God on *higher* grounds.

In regard to the Book of Ecclesiastes, the charge of its denying the doctrine of immortality has sprung from a misunderstanding of the spirit and composition of the work. If we were to wrest single passages of this book from their context, and display them as the teachings of the royal preacher (if indeed Solomon be the author), we should shrink back with amazement. But take the book as a whole, and it throws the productions of the greatest minds into the shade.

[1] Spirit of Hebrew Poetry I., p. 172. Comp. Dr. Conant's Commentary *ad loc.*

[2] Chap. 19, end.

[3] *Ibid.* Introduction to Job.

The inspired author puts himself into the position of a doubter, expatiating on the transitory condition of mankind; the vanity and vexation attending all human enjoyments, and the inequality of Providence in suffering the righteous to perish in their righteousness, and the wicked to glory in their wickedness. But he finds a remedy and consolation for all the vanities and vexations of spirit, for all the toils and perplexities which so partial a view of this world implies; and this remedy and consolation is a *just retribution hereafter:* "For," — such is the conclusion of the whole, — "for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret doing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Eccl. 12 : 14.) That the sacred writer here refers to a *future*[1] judgment, is evident from the fact that he has several times remarked that in *this* world the moral government of God does not reach a stage of perfection, as the wicked often prosper, even unto death.[2] Now, who will gainsay that the doctrine of a future *retribution* must needs proceed on the underlying idea of a future existence? The former is impossible without the latter; and that the inspired author actually believed in this idea, he has expressly told us in the very same chapter, when, speaking of the last hours of life, he says: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."[3] This verse clearly indicates the perishable nature of the body, and the imperishable nature of the soul, — an idea inevitably resulting from the Hebrew conception of man as taught in the very first chapter of Genesis.

Some critics, and among them is the learned Warburton,[4] maintain that this passage (12 : 7) has no reference to the *personal* continuance of the soul, but to a mere re-absorp-

[1] The Chaldee Version, also, paraphrases the word *judgment* by "the day of *great* Judgment."

[2] Eccl. 3 : 16; 7 : 15; 8 : 10, 14; 9 : 2, 3, 11, 12.

[3] Eccl. 12 : 7. The Targum paraphrases the latter half of this verse, thus: "Thy spiritual soul shall return in order to stand in judgment before God who gave it to thee." Ibn Ezra, in his comment to this verse, says: "Here we have an irrefutable answer against those who maintain that the soul is merely an *accidental property* of the body; for, if it were so, it could not be said to *return* to God."

[4] See Divine Legation, Bk. V., Sec. 6, (p. 197 ed. 1811).

tion into the Divine mind; "that the author of Ecclesiastes, in other words, belonged to that class of pantheistic philosophers who believed that the soul is an emanation from the Divine Spirit; and after death is re-absorbed by the latter. But the main doctrine taught in Ecclesiastes being, as we have already seen, that of a future retribution, how could the soul, if swallowed up by the Infinite All, be rewarded or punished? How could there be any difference hereafter between the good and the bad, the wise and the foolish, if all are absorbed alike by *Pan*, the vague deity of Pantheism, and thus deprived of consciousness and personality? There could then be no such thing as a future *judgment* of the soul.

In the forced interpretation which Warburton here gives, we see into what narrow straits an erroneous system is driven, that would be consistent. In order to make out that the ancient Hebrews had no knowledge of a future state, the ingenious divine is bound to assume that a doctrine destructive of all morality and religion, a doctrine which has *never* found its way into Judaism, is advocated in the Holy Scriptures! Well has Lord Brougham said: "There is nothing so plain to which the influence of a preconceived opinion, or the desire of furthering a favorite hypothesis, will not blind men. . . . . their blindness in such cases bears even a proportion to their learning and ingenuity."[1]

Having thus shown that the books of Psalms, Job, and Ecclesiastes, far from doubting or calling in question the doctrine of immortality, even contain positive declarations of the same, can there still be any doubt as to the actual existence of that doctrine among the ancient Hebrews as well as in their scriptures? What other objections can be urged to the contrary? We have seen both history and revelation confirm our view that the ancient Hebrews actually *did* believe in a future state; while the objections based on either of these great, authentic sources have arisen from a misunderstanding of the facts of history, and a false interpretation of the text of scripture. There have been, indeed, other objections advanced to make it probable that the Israelites did not have, or *could* not have had, a knowledge of an

[1] Natural Theology, p. 168.

existence hereafter. But these are so futile, and have been so often refuted, that it would be superfluous to consider them again. One objection alone, it would seem, has not yet met with a satisfactory explanation, and, therefore, deserves a momentary consideration before we close. It is the absence, in the Pentateuch, of any allusion to *future* retribution in all cases where the Divine Legislator would enforce the observance of his laws. The simple fact that Moses predicts *temporal* rewards and punishments for the observance or non-observance of the law, is considered ample proof that the people had *no idea* of a future state; and Archbishop Whately has taken great pains to parade at full length each and every passage relating to retribution in *this* life. Now, it seems to us that too great stress has been laid on this objection. For, in view of the irrefutable arguments advanced to prove the actual existence of the doctrine among the ancient Hebrews, it cannot be regarded as an objection at all, but simply as a question: *Why* the Hebrew lawgiver did not avail himself of this popular belief, as all other ancient lawgivers did, in promising *future* rewards and punishments? Now, a proper understanding of the spirit of the Mosaic legislation, and the circumstances under which that legislation took place, will easily account for this. The principal aim of Moses was to form a *nation*, and give strength and solidity to that nation by the proper enforcement of moral and civil laws. He accordingly promises victory, peace, security from wild beasts, increase of population, in case of obedience to the laws; and threatens the people with war, famine, disease, dispersion over the whole earth, in case they violated the law. These, it is evident, are all *national* blessings and *national* curses; and though the lawgiver sometimes says, "Keep the commandments, that *thou* mayest live long and prosper," he does not, as some suppose, address the *individual*, but the nation; he does not so much refer to the longevity of the individual *citizen*, as to the life and prosperity of the *whole nation*. The welfare of the law-abiding citizen must needs promote that of the entire community. When, therefore, Moses predicts rewards or penalties, he always has an eye to Israel as a

whole, speaking in the capacity of a civil legislator solicitous for the preservation of the people in the land which they were to inherit. Who, now, would, under such circumstances, expect the inculcation of *celestial* rewards or *infernal* punishments? "These," says a profound scholar,[1] "apply only to the *individual;* for he alone, and not the *nation*, as a whole, inherits immortality." Besides, *future* rewards and punishments are but rarely adapted to influence men's conduct in *this* world. Even at the present day, when the doctrine of immortality is openly confessed by all sects, both Jewish and Christian, the preacher, according to the testimony of Whately himself,[2] finds it difficult to draw the minds of his hearers from the things of this life, and fix their attention on the retribution awaiting them beyond the grave. The people of our day still continue to be affected much more by wars, epidemics, and even *financial crises.* Human nature ever remains the same; and so the prospect of *present* weal or woe, something within the grasp of every one, has always proved a far safer means of securing the fidelity and obedience of the individual, than the greatest amount of *future* happiness or misery. Indeed, when we consider that most of the ancient lawgivers strangely intermingled future with present rewards and punishments,[3] we cannot but admire the wisdom and energy of the *Hebrew* legislator, in rigidly omitting any allusion to future retribution, and trusting, by the aid of Providence, to secure universal obedience to the laws by such motives as would conduce to the welfare of the nation and the patriotism of the individual.[4]

---

[1] Saalschütz, das Mosaische Recht, chap. I.

[2] Essays (first series), pp. 73, 74, and Future State, pp. 18, 19.

[3] The legislator of the Persians, for example, disposed of the punishments in hell with the same liberty and want of moderation with which he distributes corporal punishment in this life. Thus the Zend-Avesta threatens imprisonment of three hundred thousand years in the infernal regions for even insignificant crimes. — See Saalschütz, ibid.

[4] The *existence* of the doctrine of immortality among the ancient Hebrews having been thus established, it will, no doubt, be interesting to learn the several phases which this doctrine has assumed among the Jews down to the present day. This we may be able to show in some future Article.

ARTICLE V.

COMPARATIVE PHONOLOGY: OR, THE PHONETIC SYSTEM OF THE INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.

BY BENJAMIN W. DWIGHT, CLINTON, N. Y.

[Completed from Vol. XVII., from page 302].

2d. The phonetic force of the different Greek letters, in alphabetic order; or a synoptical view of the capacities of the Greek letters, for a variable manifestation of different equivalent sounds in the Sanskrit.

A. This represents the Sanskrit a, illustrations of which will be, of course, unnecessary.

It is sometimes euphonic, and so not a radical part of the stem of a word; as in *ἀσπαίρω*, to gasp, compared with *σπαίρω*. In *ἀστέροπη* (= *ἀστηρ* + *ὄψ*) lightning, (and also *ἀστραπή*) compared with *στέροπη*, we have, on the contrary, a full and contracted form of the same word, which might readily be mistaken, but for etymological reasons, for an instance of *a euphonic*. Like the Sanskrit *a*, the Greek *α* shaded off in kindred or derived forms, in different dialects, into almost all the other vowels: as ε, Ionic *ἔρσην* for *ἄρσην*; η, Epic *θώρηξ* and *σοφίη* for *θώραξ* and *σοφία*; ο, Æolic *στροτός* for *στρατός*.

In the Doric dialect, a was almost as great a favorite in all consonantal forms, as in Sanskrit; and it abounded greatly also in the forms of the Æolic dialect. In the different dialectic forms of the genitive of *ναῦς*, a ship (Sansk. navas, Lat. navis), as Doric *ναός*, Ionic *νηός* and *νεός* and Attic *νεώς*, we see the radical vowel *α* represented by a variety of kindred vowels.

B. This is equivalent to the Sanskrit b, bh, g, j, and v.

(b) Specimens of this kind will be unnecessary.

(bh) bhar to carry, *βαστάζω*.

This aspirate is, however, most commonly represented by *φ* in Greek.

(g) gô, a cow, *βοῦς*;[1] gâ, to go, *βαίνω* (pure stem *βα*); gurus heavy, *βαρύς*.

(j) jyâ, a bowstring, *βιός*, a bow.

(v) vrish, to irrigate, *βρέχω*.

The sound of the Greek *B* was softer than ours, more like indeed, as in the Modern Greek, our v than b; or, as in Spanish, medial between the two. Before *ρ*, it was substituted in the Æolic dialect for the ordinary aspirate, as in *βρόδον* for *ῥόδον* and *βράκος* for *ῥάκος*. It was also epenthetically inserted before *ρ* after *μ*, as in *μεσημβρία*, for *μέση ἡμερα*; and *ἄμβροτος* for *ἄμροτος*.

It was interchangeable in the different dialects, with the following consonants:

(1) *π*; as in *βατεῖν* for *πατεῖν*, to tread. Before *τ* in verbal forms, according to the law of the harmonization of mutes in Greek (smooth with smooth, middle with middle, etc.), *β* is regularly changed to *π*, as in *τέτριπται* for *τέτριβται*. Compare the change of b to p in Latin before s and t, as in scripsi and scriptum from scribo.

(2) *φ*; as in *βρίγες* and *βρύγοι* compared with *φρύγες*. Cf. Lat. fremo and *βρέμω*; and balaena, a whale and *φάλαινα*.

(3) *γ*; as *γλήχων* for *βλήχων*, penny-royal. Compare, also, *βαρύς* and Lat. gravis; and also *βάλανος* an acorn and glans.

(4) *δ*; as *ὀδελός* (Doric) for *ὀβελός*, an obelisk.

(5) *μ*; as *βροτός* for *μροτός* by metathesis for *μορτός*, Sansk. marttas (mri, to die) Lat. mortuus (morior). Cf. *μύρμηξ* an ant, and Lat. formica; and also *μορμώ* a bugbear, and formido, fear.

Γ. This corresponds with the Sanskrit g, h, j, k (and ch), gh, and ç.

(g) gaûs, the earth (stem gâ), *γῆ*, Archaic *γαῖα*; sthag, to cover, *στέγω*, Lat. tego.

---

[1] Labials often represent gutturals in a cognate language, as a degenerate form of them, as in Æol. *πίς*, who; Attic *τίς*; Sansk. kis; Lat. quis.

(h) hanus, the jaw, *γένυς*, Lat. gena.

(j) jânu, the knee, *γόνυ*, Lat. genu ; jan to beget, *γεννάω* ; aj to drive, *ἄγω*; yaj to sacrifice, to worship, *ἅγιος*.

(k) kan (cf. also chad and chand of same sense) to shine, *γανάω*.

(gh) ghas, to eat, *γάνειον*, an eating-house.

(ç) paç, to bind, *πήγνυμι*, stem *παγ*.

In the Greek itself it was interchangeable with *β*, δ, *κ*, λ. Thus for *β*, compare *βλήχων* and *γλήχων* ; for δ, *γῆ* and *δᾶ* (Doric) ; for *κ*, *γνάπτω* and *κνάπτω* ; and for λ, *μόγις* and *μόλις*.

Δ. This is equivalent to the Sanskrit d, dh, j, and g.

(d) dakshas, right (as right-handed) *δεξιός* ; dvau, two, *δύω* ; dam, to subdue, *δαμάω*.

(dh) dhâman, a house, *δόμος*.

(j) jiv, to live, *δίαιτα*.

(g) guh, to conceal, *δύω* and *δύνω*, to get into, to put on. Cf. Lat. induo and exuo.

It is interchangeable in various dialects with different letters in Greek.

(1) In the Æolic dialect with *β*, as *σάμβαλον* for *σάνδαλον*.

(2) In the Doric, with *γ*, as *γαῖα* and *γῆ*, Doric *δᾶ* and also *γᾶ*. Cf. also *δνόφος* as a parallel form of *γνόφος*. So *Δημήτηρ*, Ceres, is formed from *Γη* + *μήτηρ*.

(3) In the Ionic, with *ζ*, as in *Ζεύς* and *Δεύς* ; with *κ*, as *δαίω* and *καίω* ; and with *σ*, as *ὀδμή* and *ὀσμή*.

(4) In the Attic dialect, with *τ*, as in *δάπις* and *τάπης*. It became also euphonically in the Attic in verbal forms *σ*, before *τ* and *θ*, as in *ἐψεύσθην* for *ἐψεύδθην*, and *ἔρεισται* for *ἔρειδται* ; as in Latin we find fissum for fidtum.

E. This represents the Sanskrit a, e, i, v.

(a.) api, to or towards, *ἐπί* ; ahis, a snake, *ἔχις* ; jarat an old man, *γέρων* (stem *γεροντ*) ; ana, in, *ἐν* and *εἰς* for *ἐντς*, (cf. Lat. in and with Sansk. antar among Lat. inter).

(e) êna, one, *εἷς* for *ἕνς*.

(i) pippali, pepper, *πέπερι* (Lat. piper).

(v) varman, an arming, ἔρυμα (Lat. arma); vam, to vomit, ἐμέω. Cf. vas to wish and ἔκων for *Fέκων*, Lat. invitus.

E is sometimes euphonic, as in ἐλαχύς small, Sansk. laghus, light. In ἑκατόν one hundred, the initial ἑ is not euphonic, but is an abbreviation of the numeral εἷς for ἕνς one (= ἕν + κατόν. Cf. Lat. centum, Sansk. çatam). In the Æolic dialect, ει was exchanged for η, as κῆνος for κεῖνος and κῆ for ἐκεῖ.

Z. Its equivalents in Sanskrit are d and y.

(d) dam, to conquer (Lat. domo. Cf. dominus and damnum) ζημία, loss, damage. Cf. δαμάω to subdue.

(y) yu and yuj, to bind, or join together, ζεύγνυμι; yava, barley, ζέα for ζέ*Fα*.

Z does not represent in Greek the combination, as might be supposed, of δς, τς, and θς, etymologically, but of δι and γι. Thus σχίζω is for σχίδιω (stem σχιδ); στίζω fut. στίξω (stem στιγ) is for στίγιω; (cf. Lat. instigo, Germ. stechen, Eng. stick); and μείζων is for μέγιων. It is also sometimes equivalent when initial to the simple Sanskrit y; as in ζυγόν (Lat. jugum) a yoke, and yuga equal; and ζεύγνυμι to join (Lat. jungo) Sansk. yuj to bind. In a few cases ζ represents a contraction of σδ (not δς), as Ἀθήναζε for Ἀθήνασδε. Dionysius, who yet himself represents ζ as being pronounced as δς, says that it arose from σδ. In the Doric dialect, it was indeed so written, so that Ζεύς was in Doric Σδεύς; but the analysis of its origin, as representing an earlier form δι or γι, is alike its true historical and phonetic analysis. Z early sank in sound into soft s, and was by Lucian substituted in some words for it, as in ξμικρός for σμικρός and Ζμύρνα for Σμύρνα.

Z was interchanged in Greek, when initial, by the Dorians, with δ, and, when medial, by the Tarentine Greeks with σσ; as, with δ, in the Doric forms δυγόν and δωμός for ζυγόν and ζωμός; and with σσ in the Tarentine form λακτίσσω for λακτίζω.

H. This is equivalent to the Sanskrit a. Thus the Sansk. sâmi half, Lat. semi, is in Greek ἡμι-; in which form the η represents the Sansk. long â, and the accompanying aspi-

rate represents the Sanskrit and Latin sibilant. So ἡδύς compares with Sansk. svadus, sweet, Lat. suavis; and ἧπαρ the liver, with Sansk. yakrit, Lat. jecur.

Θ. This is equivalent to the Sanskrit t, d, dh, and gh.

(t) tij, to put together, θιγγάνω, stem θιγ.

(d) duhitri, a daughter, θύγατηρ; dvar, a door, θύρα.

(dh) dhûma(s), smoke, θυμός (Lat. fumus); indh to burn, αἴθω; dhâ, to place, τίθημι, stem θε; ûdhar, a teat, οὖθαρ.

(gh) gharma, heat, θερμός. For a similar change of another guttural into a lingual, compare τίς with the Vedic kis, Lat. quis.

Θ was interchanged, in the different Greek dialects, with various letters: as σ, Doric σάω for θάω to see; φ, Æolic φήρ for θήρ, a wild beast (cf. Lat. fera, German thier, Eng. deer); δ, ψύθος poetic form of ψεῦδος, a lie; the aspirate, as θαμά in Homer and Pindar for ἅ.

I. This is equivalent to the Sanskrit a, e, and the half-vowel y.

(a) açvas, a horse, ἵππος, Æolic ἴκκος for ἴκϜος.

(e) vêtra, a reed (from vê to weave) ἰτέα for *Ϝιτέα*, Lat. vitis, Eng. withe.

(y) mahiyas comp. of mahat great (μέγας) comp. μείζων for μέγιων.

I was exchanged sometimes in Greek for ει, as in εἴλη compared with ἴλη, a band, and ἰστίη (Ionic) compared with ἑστία, for *Ϝεστία*, the hearth of a house (cf. Lat. vesta).

K. Its equivalents in Sanskrit are k, ç, ch, g, h.

(k) krî to distinguish, κρίνω (Lat. cerno, cretus and crimen); kapâlas, the skull, κεφαλή; kathinas, a bowl, κάτανος.

(ç) çangkhas, a shell κόγχη; çiras, the head, κάρα; çru to hear, κλύω (Lat. in*clytus* and gloria); daç to bite, δάκνω; daçan ten δέκα; diç to show δείκνυμι (Lat. dico and digitus); çad to fall, κατά down (Lat. cado, to fall and caedo to fell, or cut down).

(ch) cha, and, κε (and τε); chay, to go κίω.

(g) gaura, yellow, κιρρός (Lat. gilvus, German gelb, Eng. yellow).

(h) hal, to hollow, κοῖλος (Lat. cœlum, Germ. hohl, Eng.

hole, hollow and hell); hard and hridaya, the heart, *κῆρ* and *καρδία*.

K is interchangeable in Greek:

(1) with *π*; as Æolic *κῶς* and *κότε*, Attic *πῶς* and *πότε*.

(2) with *τ*; as *πόκα*, Doric form of *πότε*, and *τῆνος* Doric of *κεῖνος*.

(3) with *γ* and *χ*; as in *κνάπτω* (Old Attic) to scratch and *γνάπτω* (New Attic), and *ῥέγχω* to snore, Attic *ῥέγκω*. So in the Doric *ἀτρεχές* occurs for *ἀτρεκές*, which in Pindar is *ἀτρεκής*.

L. This is equivalent to the Sanskrit l, n, r, d, and even to the half-vowel y by assimilation.

(l) lih (Vedic rih) to lick, *λείχω* (German lechen, Eng. lick); sphal to waver, *σφάλλω* (Lat. fallo).

(n) anyas, another, *ἄλλος* for *ἄλιος* (Lat. alius,[1] ollus and ille Gothic alja). In Prâkrit, as in Greek, the half-vowel y is assimilated, and the word is there annas.

(r) rich, to leave, *λείπω*, stem *λιπ* (Lat. linquo, stem liq). So, contrarily, Sansk. lup and lump, to break, is equivalent to Lat. rumpo, perf. rupi; and Sansk. ruch to be bright, to the Greek *λευκός* bright, (Lat. lux, luceo, illustris etc).

(d) dîpa a lamp, *λάμπας* (where the root is also nasalized).

(y) Vid. *ἄλλος*, above; and so *βάλλω* is for *βάλιω*.

L is interchangeable in different dialects with various letters; as (1) in the Doric, with *ν*, where *ἦλθον* becomes *ἦνθον*. Compare double forms *πνεύμων* and *πλεύμων*; and also the Spanish nivel and French niveau, as derived from Lat. libella (diminutive of libra) a level. (2) In the Attic, with *ρ*, as *ναύκραρος* for *ναύκλαρος*, the chief of a division of citizens. (3) In the Æolic, with *δ*, as *δάφνη* and *λάφνη* the laurel. Compare in Latin oleo to smell and odor fragrance.

M. *M* is simply equivalent to Sansk. m and sm. As examples of m, see samâ together, *ἅμα* (Lat. simul and similis) and samî half, *ἥμι* (Lat. semi): of sm, smi, to laugh, *μειδάω* (for *σμειδάω*). It is interchanged in the Æolic with

[1] From this same stem alter also is formed: (-ter being a comparative suffix, Gr.-*τερος*; as also in the prepositions inter, praeter, propter and subter); and also aliquis (= alius + quis).

β and π, as ὄππα for ὄμμα and βροτός for μροτός; and in the Attic with ν, as νιν for μιν (cf. Lat. num and μῶν).

N. Its equivalents in Sanskrit are n and sn, jn, m and s.

(sn) snushâ, a daughter-in-law, νυός for σνυσός (Lat. nurus); snu, to flow, νέω (for σνέFω) fut. νεύσω.

(jn) jnâ, to know, νοέω for γνοέω (cf. γιγνώσκω). Compare νοῦς the mind; Lat. nosco for gnosco; and Eng. know.

(m) *M* final in original forms is everywhere changed in Greek to ν: as in the person-endings, for the first person, of the imperfect active, and of the first and second aorists passive; the nominative case-ending of the 2d declension neuter (Greek -ον, Sansk. -am, Lat. -um); and the accusative singular and genitive plural endings in ν; in all of which respects, the Latin more nearly represents the original form than the Greek. Thus ἔφερον is for ἔφερομ(ι); πόσιν (acc. of πόσις) is for πόσιμ Sansk. patim; and ποδῶν is for ποδῶμ, Sansk. padâm.

(s) Final ς in Sanskrit is often represented by ν in the Greek equivalent, as in the plural active suffix -μεν (Doric -μες) Sansk. -mas, Lat. -mus for the first person of verbs; and so in the 2d and 3d person dual endings -τον and -την for Sansk. -thas and -tas.

N is exchanged, especially in the Æolic dialect with λ and μ.

Ξ. The equivalents of this letter in Sanskrit are ksh and sh.

(ksh) akshas, an axle, ἄξων (Lat. axis).

(sh) shash, six, ἕξ (Lat. sex).

For initial ξ the Dorians used sometimes σκ, as σκίφος for ξίφος.

O. This represents the Sanskrit a, as dhâman, a house, δόμος (Lat. domus); akshas the eye, ὄκος and ὄσσε for original ὄκιε (Lat. oculus); avis a sheep, ὄϊς for *oFις* (Lat. ovis.) Like *a* and ε, the letter *o* is sometimes euphonic, as in ὀκέλλω compared with κέλλω (Lat. -cello, celer etc.); ὀδύρομαι with δύρομαι (cf. δύη pain and δυς hard Sansk. du to suffer pain); and ὀρέγω Sansk. râj Lat. rego.

O was interchanged in the Æolic dialect with *a*, *ε*, *υ*, *ω*; and in the Doric with *οι*: as with

(*a*) Æolic *στροτός*, for *στρατός* an army;
" *ὄνω* for *ἄνω* upwards;
(*ε*) " *ἔδοντες* for *ὀδόντες* the teeth;
(*υ*) " *ὔμοιος* for *ὅμοιος* similar;
(*ω*) " *ὅρα* for *ὥρα* a season:
(*οι*) Doric *ποία* and Ionic *ποίη* for *πόα* grass.

O, sometimes called a movable *o*, is often substituted in derived forms for a radical vowel, as in *λόγος* from *λέγω*, *στόλος* from *στέλλω*, *πόρος* from *περάω*, *τρόχος* from *τρέχω*. Cf. in Latin socius from sequor, sodalis from sedeo, nodus from necto.

Π. The equivalents of *π* in Sanskrit are p, b, v, k.

(p) pitar a father *πατήρ*; parâ farther *παρά*; apa from, *ἀπό* (Lat. ab).

(b) budh and bundh, to know, to learn, *πυνθάνομαι*, stem *πυθ*.

(v) varâhas, a boar, *πόρκος* (Lat. porcus and verres).

(k) kadâ, when, *πότε*; kati, how many, *πόσος* Æol. *κόσος*.

Π is interchangeable in Greek with *γ*, as *λαπαρός* and *λαγαρός*, slack; with *κ*, as *πόσος* and Ionic *κοσός*; with *τ*, as *πέντε* and Æolic *πέμπε*; and with *β* and *φ* as *βάλλω* and *πάλλω* (cf. Lat. pello, palpo and palpito); and *σπόγγος*, Attic *σφόγγος*, a sponge (cf. Lat. fungus).

P. This letter represents the Sanskrit r, dr, sr, bh, vr, ghr.

(r) urus, wide, *εὐρύς*; ar to rise, *ὄρνυμι* Lat. orior.

(dr) draksha, a grape, *ῥάξ* (Lat. racemus, Fr. raisin, Eng. race and raisin).

(sr) sru, to pour forth, *ῥέω* for *σρέϜω*.

(bh) bhanj, to break, *ῥήγνυμι* for *Ϝρήγνυμι* (Lat. frango).

(vr) vri, to cover, *ῥινός* the rind.

(ghr) ghrân, the nose, *ῥίς* gen. *ῥινός*.

P is interchanged in the Æolic dialect with *σ*, as *οὖτορ* for *οὗτος*, *μάρτυρ* for *μάρτυς*; and so Laconic *τίρ* for *τίς* and *νεκύρ* for *νεκύς*. (Cf. Lat. arbor and arbos, honor and honos, and eram for esam, imperf. of sum). It was also prefixed sometimes in the Æolic dialect with *β*, to represent what was in

other dialects the aspirate, as *βρόδον* for *ῥόδον*, *βρίζα* for *ῥίζα*, etc.

In the Attic it was interchanged with λ, as *σιγηρός* for *σιγηλός*. Cf. in same way Lat. lilium a lily, with *λείριον*. It was also sometimes transposed by metathesis, as *κάρτος* for *κράτος*.

The letter r was called by the ancients the canine letter, as it is a continuous rolling r-sound that an angry snarling dog makes.

Σ. Σ is equivalent to ç and s in Sanskrit.

(ç) çarkaga, candied sugar, *σάκχαρον*. (Lat. saccharum, Germ. zucker, Fr. sucre.)

(s) stabh to press together and stambh to support, *στείβω* and *στέμβω*; sphal, to deviate *σφάλλω* (Lat. fallo, Fr. faillir, Span. faltar, Eng. fail, fall, fell, falter, false, fault.)

Its dialectic interchanges are with δ, ϑ, τ, ττ, ξ, the aspirate, and ρ: as with δ, Æol. and Dor. *ἴδμεν* for *ἴσμεν*; with ϑ, Dor. *ἀγασός* for *ἀγαϑός*; with τ, Æol. and Dor. *τυ* for *συ*; with ττ, *πέσσω* Sansk. pach, to cook and collateral form *πέπτω*; with ξ, Dor. *τριξός* for *τρίσσος* and *ξύν* for *σύν*.

T. Its equivalents in Sanskrit are t, th, dh, ch and k.

(t) anti over against, *ἀντί* (Lat. ante); pat to fly *πέτομαι*; tan, to extend, *τείνω* for *τένιω*.

(th) asthi, a bone, *ὀστέον* (Lat. os for oss, for ost); sthâ to stand *ἵστημι*, stem *στα*; sthiras, fixed, firm, *στερεός*.

(dh) dhâ, to place, *τίϑημι*, stem *ϑε*.

(ch) cha, and, *κε* and *τε*.

(k) kas, who, *τίς* Lat. quis. So, *τέσσαρες* is for *κέσσαρες*, for *κέτFαρες*, Sansk. catvâras, Lat. quatuor (pronounced as if katuor); and *πέντε* Æol. *πέμπε* is for *πέγκε*, Sansk. panchan, five, Lat. quinque.

The following are its dialectic interchanges: ϑ, σ and π. For ϑ, compare *αὖϑις* and Ionic *αὖτις*; for σ, *συ*, and Æol. *τυ*. (For a similar change in the modern languages compare Lat. stratus, part. of sterno, Span. strada, Germ. Strasse, Eng. street; and Germ. essen with Lat. edo, Gr. *ἐσϑίω*, Eng. eat.) For π compare *τέσσαρες*, Doric *πέπορες* and *πέντε*, Dor. *πέμπε*. Compare similarly *σπουδή* and Lat. studium zeal; *τάως*, a

peacock and pavo; and also in Latin itself hospes and hostis, the primary meaning of both of which is the same, a stranger.

T. T corresponds with the Sanskrit a, u, v, sv.

(a) sam, with, *σύν*; nakhas, a nail, *ὄνυξ*.

(u) upari, above, *ὑπέρ*; udan water, *ὕδωρ*, stem *ὕδατ*.

(v) dvau, two, *δύω*; vê and vap to weave, *ὑφαίνω*; tvam, thou, *σύ* (Lat. tu); çvan, a dog, *κύων*. (So cf. Lat. suus, Sansk. svas). As with i and j, so u is but a vowelized form of v, or, which is the same thing, v is but a hard consonantal form of u.

(sv) svapnas, a dream, *ὕπνος*.

In the Greek dialects *υ* was interchanged with *α*, *ι*, *ο*, *ω*, *οι*. For (*α*) compare *σάρξ* and Æol. *σύρξ*, as also *τέσσαρες* and Æol. *πίσυρες*; for (*ι*) see *φευτεύω* and poet. *φιτύω*: for (*ο*) *ὄνομα* and *ὄνυμα* (Æol.); for (*ω*) *χελώνη* and Æol. *χηλύνη*; and for (*οι*) *χρυσός* and Æol. *χροισός*.

Φ. The equivalents of *φ* in Sanskrit are bh, p, ph, v.

(bh) bhû to be, *φύω* (Lat. fui and fore); bhid to divide, *φείδομαι* (reflexive), (cf. German beissen, Eng. bite); bhâ, to shine, *φαίνω* (cf. *φημί* and Latin for and facio); bhar and bhri, to bear, *φέρω*; bhuj, to turn or bend, *φεύγω*, stem *φυγ* (Latin fugio).

(p) pâl, to love, *φιλέω*; prâna breath, spirit, *φρήν*.

(ph) phullan, a blossom, *φύλλον*.

(v) svas his, *σφός*, Lat. suus.

Φ is interchangeable in Greek with *π* and *θ*: with *π*, as Æol. *σπόγγος* for *σφόγγος*, and, in the Doric, *ἐπιορκέοιμι* occurs for *ἐφιορκέοιμι*; and with *θ*, as Æol. *θήρ*, Attic *φήρ*, as also *θλίβω* and Æol. *φλίβω*.

X. The letter *χ* represents variously the Sanskrit h, kh, g, çr.

(h) hrish, to rejoice *χαίρω*; hyas, yesterday, *χθές*; lih to lick, *λείχω*.

(kh) khola(s) wavering, *χωλός*; nakhas a nail *ὀνυξ*, gen. *ὄνυχος*.

(g) garhan, an enclosure *χόρτος* (Lat. hortus and cohors; Eng. cohort and court); gaura, *χολή* bile.

(çr) çrat, credit, *χράω* to lend (Lat. *cre*do = çrat + dâ Sansk.).

The interchanges of *χ* in Greek are in the Ionic with *κ* as *δέκομαι* for *δέχομαι*, and so the Sicilian Greeks made *χιτών* a tunic *κιτών*; and in the Doric with *θ*, as *ὄρνιχος*, gen. of *ὄρνις* a bird for *ὄρνιθος*.

Ψ. As *ψ* represents the combination of any one of the labials with *σ*, its equivalents are of the same general sort with theirs. In *ὄψ* the voice (Sansk. vachs Lat. vox) it represents the Sansk. chs.

Ψ was interchanged in Greek with *σπ*, as *σπάλιον* for *ψάλιον*; with *σφ*, as by the Dorians and the Syracusan Greeks *σφίν* was made *ψίν*; and with *σ*, as *ψιττακός* for *σιττακός*. There are also some correllate forms in *ψ* and *ξ*, as *ψάω* and *ξάω*.

Ω. This letter is representative of the Sanskrit a, v, y.

(a) âsus, quick, *ὠκύς*: çvan a dog, *κύων*.

(v) vâra, time, *ὥρα* (Lat. hora, Fr. heure, Germ. jahr and uhr, Eng. hour and year); van to sell, *ὠνέομαι* (Lat. vendo).

(y) yat, *ὡς* (for *ὡτ*).

The Greek interchanges of *ω* are with *α*, *αυ*, *ου*, *ο*: with *α* as Ionic *ὤνθρωπος* for *ἄνθρωπος*, Doric *πρᾶτος* for *πρῶτος*; with *αυ*, *θῶμα* Ionic for *θαῦμα* wonder; with *ου*, *ὠρανός*, heaven, Æolic for *οὐρανός*; and with *ο*, *ὀτειλή* Æolic for *ὠτειλή*, a wound.

3d. Special Pathological Affections of the Greek.

I. Digammation.

II. Sibilation.

III. Aspiration.

IV. Reduplication.

V. Nasalization.

These affections of words, while pertaining more or less to the three classical languages in common, have a special relevancy to the Greek in respect to their influence on the forms of the language, or the prominence with which they appear, as special features of it.

I. Digammation.

The digamma, or double-gamma, *F*, was originally the

sixth letter of the Grecian alphabet. It corresponded to the Phenician Vau and the Latin F. In some old Peloponnesian inscriptions in the Laconic or Doric dialect, this character, is found representing it. The Laconians, indeed, and especially the Laconian colonists of Heraclea in Southern Italy, and the Cretans, showed much more fondness for retaining the digamma, in either its natural form, or as softened into *β*, than most of the other Greeks. The name digamma was given by both the Greek and Roman grammarians to this character, because its form was that of two gammas united, one above the other, in one compound symbol. From the great fondness of the Æolians for this letter, it was often called the Æolic digamma. It was used at first by all the Greeks; or, in other words, it was one of the characteristics of the Pelasgic or Pioneer period of Greek development; and, as it is not found in any Attic or Ionic inscriptions, it must have fallen very early into disuse by the Ionian race.

It was probably pronounced very much like our w in its softened form; for Dionysius says, that it sounded like *ου*. Its corresponding vowel is *υ*; and it is often changed into it, as in the diphthongs *αυ* and *ευ*; which at times originate in this way, as well as *ου*, when not formed by lengthening *ο*, to represent a contracted form. Thus *βοῦς*, *ναῦς* and *πλεύσω*, fut. of *πλέω*, are for *βόFς* (Lat. bos for bovs, gen. bovis) *νάFς* *πλέFσω*.

As the digamma lost its distinct symbol, it underwent several interesting transformations, such as the following:

(1) It was sometimes, when initial, weakened into a mere breathing, as *ἕσπερος* for *Fέσπερος* (Lat. vesper and Hesperia), *ἑστία* for *Fεστία* (Lat. vesta) and *ἕννυμι* for *Fεσνυμι* (Lat. vestio to clothe).

(2) It was changed by the Laconians, and some others of the Dorian family, into *β*, *γ*, or *φ*, as,

βέργον, work, for *Fέργον*, later, *ἔργον* (Germ. werk, Eng. work).
βίδειν to see, for *Fίδειν*, later, *εἶδειν* (Lat. videre).
βίκατι twenty for *Fείκατι*, later, *εἴκοσι* (Sansk. vinçati).
γισχύς force and *βισχύς* for *Fισχύς*, later, *ἰσχύς* (*ἴς* and Lat. vis).
γιτέα a willow, for *Fιτέα*, later, *ἰτέα* (Lat. vitex).

(3). It was changed in some cases to *o*, as in *Οἴτυλος* and *Βείτυλος* for *Fίτυλος*, a Laconian town, also called *Τύλος*.

(4). It was sometimes softened into *υ*, as in *ναῦς* for *νάFς*.

(5). It was completely rejected, as in *ἔαρ* for *Fέαρ* Lat. ver; *οἶκος* for *Foίκος*, Lat. vicus. Cf. *Ἰταλός* and *Ἰταλία* (Italy) for *Fιταλός* etc. Lat. vitulus: so called on account of its fine oxen.

Some words originally beginning with two consonants, the first of which was the digamma, have remaining but a mere weakened form of one of them, as Sansk. svadus, sweet, Gr. *ἡδύς* for *σFηδύς*. (Cf. Lat. suavis, where the original sv are both represented; and also Sansk. svapnas, sleep, (Gr. *ὕπνος* for *σFύπνος*, Lat. somnus for sopnus for svopnus). Thus, by the comparison of many Sanskrit forms and their Latin equivalents with kindred forms in Greek, which are now aspirated or contracted, or otherwise marked as having once had a fuller form of another sort, we assure ourselves absolutely of the fact, that the archaic form of the Greek was itself also digammated.

It is clear, that in Homer's time many words had the digamma, which afterwards lost it. The concurrence of two vowels in the radical part of a word would make a hiatus,[1] particularly disagreeable to a Greek ear; which both poets and prose writers would seek carefully to avoid. In the case of words that at first had the digamma, such a hiatus did not originally exist, of course, when the preceding word ended in a vowel; and, in the absence of the digamma, accordingly, they are still found occurring together, as when it did exist, as in *πρὸ ἕϑεν* for *πρὸ Fέϑεν* (for *σFέϑεν*). For the same reason, the influence of the lost *F* of a once digammated word is still felt, in making with a preceding consonant the vowel originally followed by them both, although one of them is now wanting, long by position.

The following are some of the most important specimens of Greek words that were beyond doubt once digammated:

[1] The hiatus of two vowels in juxtaposition was far less offensive to the Latin ear, than to the Greek, and less even to the Greek than to the Indian.

(1) Initially.

ἄγνυμι, to break, for *Fάγνυμι*.

ἀνδάνω, to please, for *Fανδάνω*.

ἄστυ, a city, for *Fαστυ* (Sansk. vastu from vas to dwell).

ἔαρ, spring, and *ἦρ* for *Fέαρ* (Persian behâr, Lat. ver).

εἴδω, to see, for *Fίδω* (Lat. video, Sansk. vid).

ἔννυμι, to clothe for *Fέσνυμι* (Lat. vestio, Sansk. vas).

ἕλλω, to seize, for *Fέλλω* (Lat. vello).

ἔργον, work, for *Fέργον* (cf. Sansk. vay to bestir one's self).

ἕσπερος, evening for *Fέσπερος* (Æol. *φέσπερε*, Lat. vesper and Hesperia, cf. Sansk. vas to cut off and vasati night.

ἑστία, the hearth, for *Fεστία* (Lat. vesta; Sansk. vas, to dwell).

ἴον, the violet, for *Fίον* (Lat. viola).

ἰός, poison, for *Fίος* (Lat. virus, Sansk. vishas).

ἶς, force, for *Fίς* (Lat. vis, pl. vires for vises).

ἰτέα, a willow for *Fιτέα* (Sansk. vêtra a reed Lat. vitex).

οἶκος, a house, for *Foῖκος* (Sansk. vêsas, Lat. vicus).

οἶνος, wine, for *Foῖνος*, Cretan *βοῖνος* (Lat. vinum; cf. Sansk. vêna beloved).

ῥήγνυμι, to break for *Fρήγνυμι* (Lat. frango, Sansk. bhanj).

ὠνέομαι to buy for *Fωνέομαι* (Sansk. van, Lat. *ven*do).

ἴδιος, own, peculiar for *Fίδιος* (Sansk. vidh, to separate, Lat. viduus, divido and individuus).

ὅς, and 3d pers. pronoun *οὗ*, *οἷ*, *ἕ* for *σFός*, *σFοῦ* etc. Cf. suus and sui, sibi etc. in Latin.

(2) Medially.

αἰές, *αἰέν* and *αἰεί*, always, for *αἰFεί* (Lat. aevum and *αἴων*, Sansk. êvas, a moving or going).

βοῦς, an ox, for *βόFς* (Lat. bos gen. bovis, Fr. boeuf Eng. beef and beeves).

κληΐς, a key, for *κληFίς*. (Lat. clavis, Fr. cléf).

λαιός, left, for *λαιFός*. (Lat. laevus).

λεῖος, light, for *λεῖFος*. (Lat. levis, Eng. lift, lever, etc.).

σάος, safe, for *σάFος*. (Lat. salvus, Eng. safe).

σκαιός, left, for *σκαιFός*. (Lat. scaevus, Germ. schief, Eng. skew).

νεός, new, for *νεFός*. (Lat. novus, Sansk. navas).

ὄϊς, a sheep, for *ὄFις*. (Lat. ovis, Sansk. avis).

ὠόν, an egg, for ὠ*Fόν* (Lat. ovum, Fr. oeuf).
Doric ὄ*Fεα*,[1] with which compare ὤεα, in Epicharmus).

Between two vowels, therefore, an original digamma often dropped quietly out of sight; leaving not a trace behind it of its former existence. Thus πλέω is for πλε*F*ω (root πλυ, and, when gunated, πλευ) Sansk. plavâmi, I wash; and κλαίω Attic κλάω, to weep, fut. κλαύσομαι, is for κλα*F*ιω, Sansk. çravayâmi. Other words of this sort are πνέω, pure stem πνυ; νέω, stem νυ; ῥέω, stem ῥυ; and θέω stem θυ. The analysis of this class of forms is this: the final υ of the stem was lengthened to ευ, as a mode of strengthening it; but ευ before vowels became, in early Greek, ε*F*, from which finally *F* dropped away, as everywhere else in the language, because distasteful to the cultivated Greek sense. The different stages, accordingly, through which the stem πλυ went, may be thus represented: πλυ — πλευ — πλε*F* — πλε.

II. Sibilation.

S is a sui generis sound, which, like the sponge, mediate, as it were, between a vegetable and an animal, or the bat, between birds and quadrupeds, occupies a sort of middle ground between a consonant and a vowel; uniting the characteristics of them both. While various letters, found in some languages, are wanting in others, as the letter v or w, or the French u, like, also, the compound consonants, termed the nasal ng and the guttural ch, not to speak of more still; no language fails to possess the sibilant s. Its two chief sounds are the soft and hard, or its s- and z-sounds. With ch in some languages, as the German, and h in others, as ours, it forms a softened compound-sound, in which it appears in its most agreeable form, at least to modern ears, and which was not known at all to the ancients.

[1] The Æolians and Dorians kept the digamma in the beginning of many words (as Æolic *Fέτος* a year, Doric *Fίδιος*, own, peculiar), and the Heracleans in Magna Graecia preserved it in many inscriptions, in words, in which it does not occur in any of the other dialects, or exhibit any signs of having occurred; while as strangely they have omitted it in many words, in which it does occur in the other dialects. Ahrens, Vol. II., p. 42.

S often occurred initially in Greek, and was pronounced, in such cases, with its sharp sibilant sound; but it was as little pleasing to the Greek ear as to the French; and on this account, it was so frequently exchanged for the rough breathing in many words, whose original stems possessed it; as in ἕξ (sex) and ἑπτά (septem).

When occurring in the middle of a word, it is manifest that it had a very soft sound, as it so often fell out from weakness, as in βουλευῇ for βουλεύεαι, for βουλεύεσαι, and ἐβουλεύου, for ἐβουλεύεο, for ἐβουλεύεσο, and γένους for γένεος for γένεσος.

In Latin, between two vowels, and at the end of words, when it formed a part of their original stem, it passed into r; so weak was its sound, or rather its power of retaining its own permanence; as in Papirius for original Papisius, Valerius for Valesius, honor and arbor for honos and arbos, and generis and foederis, genitives of stems originally ending in s, as genes and foedes. So eram is for esam, imperf. of sum — for esum (i); and corpus is for corpos, for subsequent corpor, as the stem. Compare, also, honor and honestus, robur and robustus, arbor and arbustum.

The term assibilation is used to denote the combination of the sibilant with the various mutes, as in ps, ts, and ks, gz and dz. In Greek, this assibilation is represented by the compound letters ψ and ξ, occurring in all parts of words, as the beginning, middle, and end. With regard to ζ, see previous page.

The graphic symbols ξ and ψ were added by Simonides, in the times of the Persian wars (B. C. 500), to the Greek syllabarium.

The final s, so often found affixed, in the classical languages, at the end of nominal and adjective bases, in the nominative, and called properly the gender-sign, represents the Sanskrit personal pronouns he and she (Sansk. sa, he; sâ, she; tat, it. Cf. ὁ, ἡ, το, and Germ. sie, she; and Eng. he and she). This affix is a sign, at once, to the eye, that personality is predicated of the noun receiving it; it carries with itself a vitalizing force. The tendency to the imperso-

nation, in thought, of material objects, is very strong indeed, in not only poetical natures as such, who love to see and to feel the reflection of their own vitality, from every mute form of beauty around them; but also, especially, in the early, impressible, and imaginative period of a nation's first intellectual life.

III. Aspiration.

The influence of climate on the tendency to aspiration, in any language, is very great, and even, in fact, determinate, it would seem, of the whole taste and tendency of a people in that direction. "Nowhere," says Benary," is a simple dialectic difference, in the use of aspiration, more significant than in Germany; so that, he who should go from the highlands of that country in the centre, to the low plains of the north, might mark, quite well, the successive steps of decline, in its use, from his starting-point, until, on arriving at Denmark, all traces of its use would disappear." So, in Italy, the Sabines who lived among the mountains, were specially fond of aspiration; while the Romans, dwelling on the broad plains of Latium, were averse from[1] it.

Each of the three cardinal classes of mutes, the gutturals, labials, and linguals, has its own aspirate. The aspirates may be classified as follows:

1. The Guttural Aspirates.
   (1) The Greek. The rough breathing ' and χ.
   (2) The Latin. H and ch (of Greek origin).
2d. The Labial Aspirates.
   (1) Greek, φ, *F* (obsolete).
   (2) Latin, f, ph (of Greek origin).
3d. The Lingual or Dental Aspirates.
   (1) Greek, ϑ, σ.

[1] Says Cicero "aversus a vero." Oration IV., in Catilinam § 9. The very *a* in aversus is a for ab, from. How empty, therefore, Webster's remark under this word, that "it is absurd to speak of an affection of the mind exerted *from* an object." It is surely the most natural thing in the world, to speak of a state of feeling, as turned away from a given object.

(2) Latin s and th (of Greek origin).

The genuine aspirates, except s, are of course all double sounds, consisting of some mute, as the stable element, and an added breathing; so that they correspond, among consonants, to diphthongs among vowels. The Greek is rich in this class of mixed consonants, as it is also in diphthongal mixtures among vowels; while the Latin is poor in them both; and the Slavic languages are almost wholly destitute of them. The original forms of the aspirates were for the guttural, gh; for the labial, bh; and for the dental, dh. Curtius classifies the Indo-European languages, in five divisions,[1] in respect to the phenomena of their aspirates.

1. The Sanskrit[2] by itself: exhibiting the original bases, in the aspirates gh, bh and dh, of the whole system of aspiration, in any and all languages; and yet gh often settles in Sanskrit, into mere h, as lih for ligh. Gr. λείχω, Lat. lingo; and mahat great, for maghat, Gr. μεγας, Lat. magnus.

2. All those languages, which, by giving up the breathing, remove the difference between the medial aspirates and the medials themselves in given forms; as the Zend, which, while sometimes retaining the aspirates, at other times weakens them to medials, as in gh, bh, dh, weakened to g, b, d.

3. That embracing the Germanic languages, which has, with the same characteristics as those that mark the second class, an additional tendency to a strengthening of the mute element of the aspirates, as of g in gh into k; of d in dh into t; and of b in bh into p.

4. The Greek in all its dialects with its tenues aspirated, instead of the original medial aspirates; in which it is the exact counterpart of the second and third classes.

5. The Italic languages having only the two aspirates, h and f.

To the above schedule, drawn so well by Curtius, might

[1] Zeitschrift Der Sprachforschung, Vol. II., pp. 328—334.

[2] The scale of aspirates in Sanskrit, while reducible to the simple elements above stated, is full of varied forms of them, as gh, kh, ch, chh, jh, as well as bh, ph, dh and th, and compound consonantal aspirates as ksh, chch, chchh, nchh, nth, ddh, dbh, mbh, dhr, sth, sch, kshm, chchhy, chchhr, ddhy, etc.

be added, properly, for an absolutely complete view of the aspirates.

6. The Slavic languages, as the end of the scale, and the antipodes in its particulars of the Sanskrit: being nearly wanting in aspirates of any kind.

The stronger the aspiration, the more is the mute itself, which is aspirated, covered up by it; and the weaker the aspiration, the more distinct the sphere and scope of the mute.

The following are some of the more noticeable principles, pertaining to the aspirates:

§ 1. Since the aspirates possess, as a class, a special nature of their own, in common; they are more readily exchanged for each other, in passing from one language or dialect of the same language to another, than are the other mutes.

§ 2. The stronger the aspirate, so much easier the exchange.

1. Aspirates in Greek.

1st. What the aspirates represent, as their originals or equivalents.

The rough breathing in Greek represents

(1) The Sanskrit sibilant, as its equivalent. Instances abound, as

SANSKRIT.	LATIN.	GREEK.
sarp, to creep,	serpo and repo,	*ἕρπω.*
sad, to sit,	sedeo,	*ἕζομαι.*
sam, with, together,	cum and simul,	*ἅμα.*

(2) An obliterated s medial as *ἧμαι* for *ἧσμαι.*

(3) v, or the digamma *F.* See digammation. So also, *ἑκόντι* is for *Fεκοντι* Sansk. vaçant and *ἕνεκα* for *ἕνFεκα* Æol. *ἕννεκα* Ionic *εἵνεκα.*

(4) It sometimes represents both an obliterated sibilant and digamma, as in *ἓ* for *σFέ, ἡδύς* for *σFαδύς.* So compare *ἑός, ὅς* and *σφός,* his, as various equivalent forms to the one Sansk. form svas, Lat. suus. *Ἴδιος* likewise is claimed by some as for *σFίδιος,* from same root, as Sansk. svas, own.

(5) The half-vowel y initial. Thus *ὅς,* the relative adj.

pronoun, represents the Sansk. yas, who; ἦπαρ, gen. ἥπατος, for ἥπαρτος, Sansk. yakrit, from yakart, Lat. jecur; ὑμεῖς, for ὑμμεῖς, for original ὑσμεῖς, Sansk. yusma; and ἥμερος, tame Sansk. yam to restrain; and ἄζω, for ἅγιω (cf. ἅγιος), Sansk. yaj to worship.

2d. The effects of aspirates on letters immediately preceding them.

(1) A hard mute (π, κ, τ) is changed into the corresponding aspirate φ, χ, ϑ, by an aspirated vowel succeeding it.

§ 1. In composition, as ἐφήμερος (=ἐπί+ἡμέρα).

§ 2. At the end of a word, whether the conjunction occurs regularly, or by apocope, as οὐχ οὗτος; ἀφ' ἡμέρας; νύχϑ' ὅλην.

(2) The alliteration of two aspirates of the same kind, in successive syllables, displeased the Greek ear; so that one of them may be said to have annulled the other, or rendered it impossible; as, in all reduplicated forms of verbs in -μι, like τίϑημι, and likewise reduplicated perfects generally, as πεφίληκα.

II. Aspirates in Latin.

There are but two aspirates in Latin, h and f.

1st. The following facts exhibit the function of h, in Latin.

(1) It may represent any one of the following Sanskrit aspirates h, bh, gh: h, as heri for hesi, yesterday (cf. hesternus), Sansk. hyas; bh, as mihi for mibhi, Sansk. mabhyam; and gh, as hospes a guest Sansk. ghas, to eat.

It belongs only to vowels and to them as succeeding it, and is found indeed in the middle of words, only between two vowels, as in nihil and traho; but its possession of its place, or of any phonetic power in it, is so very feeble, that it is readily removed, for the convenience of a contracted form, as in nil for nihil and vemens for vehemens; while for prosodial effect it is treated, when occurring between two vowels, as if it did not exist at all.

(2) Its conversion with s, when in conjunction with it, into x, has analogies of a parallel and illustrative sort in the Sanskrit.

When h is reduplicated in Sanskrit, it becomes some-

times g, as in hâ to leave, which becomes gahâmi, instead of hahâmi (cf. Sansk. hri to seize, Gr. χείρ and Lat. gero); and so, in the middle of a word, hs becomes ks, as in mêxyâmi, for maihsyami, fut. of mih to urinate (cf. Lat. traxi and vexi perf.'s of traho and veho). In both Greek and Latin, g is often the equivalent of the Sanskrit h, as in γένυς, Lat. gena, Sansk. hanus; ἐγών and ego Sansk. aham; and, as in these instances we have for the guttural equivalent the medial mute γ, so, in the following instances, we have likewise the smooth mute κ representing the Sanskrit h: καρδία, Lat. cor(d), Sansk. hard, hrid and hridaya, and necto Sansk. nah.

(3) H is not so much a consonant as a breathing. It differs from the sibilant, physiologically, only in being a breathing through the whole open mouth, with the tongue at rest on its base and the teeth apart; while the sibilant is a breathing through the teeth, in a nearly closed state, with the tongue against the upper teeth. H and s are therefore both breathings and differ, only in the different positions of the tongue and teeth. The sibilant and aspirate have accordingly an etymological, as well as phonetic, parallelism with each other; and the sibilant, as has been abundantly shown, fades away readily in the Greek into the aspirate.

(4) Ch, although found in Latin, is not properly a Latin combination.

It occurs seldom and is resolvable: (1) sometimes into a specimen of wrong orthography, in imitation by the Latin grammarians of the Greek, who, as the founders of the science of language, as of so many other sciences and arts, gave law to the Romans in all matters of theoretic and formal criticism; and (2) into the resulting form of a contraction.

Ch occurs in a few proper names as Bacchus (Βάκχος) and Gracchus. The strictly Roman words, in which it is found, are the following four: pulcher, misspelled for pulcer, the original form, which, like the Gr. φύλλον, a leaf, (pl. foliage) represents the Sansk. phullan, a blossom; brachium, which is but the Latinized Greek word βραχίων, Sansk. bahu; inchoö, which is contracted, as old manuscripts show,

from incoho; and sepulchrum, in which the suffix -chrum is misspelled for -crum, meaning the place or the means of any given act described in the root, as in the words lavacrum (lavo) and fulcrum (fulcio). Cicero spells the word, sepulcrum, and states directly that the ancients did not aspirate words. Inchoo is regarded by some, as a strictly Greek word (*ἐνχώννυμι*, to gather in heaps, i.e. for building). Benary conceives of it, in the light of its original form incoho, as contracted, like traho in his view for traveho, from an original form incoveho (in+con+veho), to bear together: the loss of the radical syllable ve being accounted for by syncope, as in nôram for noveram. If Benary's analysis be accepted, we shall have but three verbal roots in Latin, in which h occurs, as the final letter of the stem — traho, veho, and coho; and these will be still farther reducible to but one ultimate form, veho (Sansk. vah to bear cf. Gr. *ὀχέω*). Leo Meyer[1] however, laughs at such a derivation of traho (as tra-veho) and derives it, like the Gothic dragan (Eng. draw) and German tragen, from the Sanskrit drâgh to stretch out, to lie on the ground, to be weary (cf. Germ. träge idle). With this he compares also Sansk. dîrgha long, Gr. *δολιχός* and Sanks. darh, to be long. But Meyer, in his notions of the origin of traho, stands, it is believed, by himself.

Since the aspirate combines in Sanskrit with the medial mutes, as well as with the soft, that is, with d as well as with t; and b as well as p; and c as well as k; it was probably weaker than in most of the cognate languages.

2d. The function of F in Latin.

(1) F is a much more positive, definite, aspirate than h. It occurs in combination with l and r; is capable of being doubled (as in effero) and maintains its position between two vowels against any and all tendencies to contraction. It occurs almost entirely in the beginning of words, and seldom in the middle.

(2) It is equivalent, etymologically, to several Sanskrit aspirates, as dh, ch, h, bh; and to the unaspirated letters, m, p, dv.

---

[1] Zeitschrift, etc. Vol. VI., p. 223.

(dh), inferus from infra, Sansk. adharâ(s) lower, comparative form of adhas below. Cf. also the superlative forms in the two languages adhamas and infimus; the Latin form throughout being nasalized. In Afer also Africa and Africus, f is equivalent to the same consonant in the same word, adharâ(s), meaning the lower or inferior place or places.

(ch) fundo (root fud) Sansk. chut to pour forth. Gr. χέω fut. χεύσω: (cf. also Gr. χολή and fel, the gall-bladder).

(h) rufus (cf. ruber) Sansk. rohitâs Gr. ἐρυθρός (with which compare also Sansk. rudhira blood).

(bh), fremo, to murmur Sansk. bhran, Gr. βρέμω; fanum a temple, for fagnum, (like finis for fignis from figo) Sansk. bhaj to honor.

(m) formica, Gr. μύρμηξ. The Greek equivalent Benary regards, as immediately corresponding with the Sanskrit root mush, to steal, which in the Greek form is reduplicated, so as to express the idea more strongly: the -ηξ being in his view a mere denominative suffix, like -ex in Lat. senex gen. senis. Compare in same way frendo to gnaw (pure stem fred, as in supine fresum for fredtum) and Sanskrit mrid (with which also for a double equivalent of same root, cf. Lat. mordeo, like repo and serpo in Latin, compared with Sansk. sarp, to creep, Gr. ἕρπω).

(p), foeteo, Sansk. puy, to be corrupt or fetid, Gr. πύθω, (cf. also Sansk. puyan corrupt matter, Gr. πῦον and Lat. pus). Compare similarly fodio to dig and Sansk. budh to find out (that is, physically,) and Gr. βυθός depth, the root being βυθ or βοθ, as in βόθρος a pit (cf. also βάθος and βαθύς).

(dv), fores, Sansk. dvâr, a door, Gr. θύρα. So festus, in the word infestus (the preposition in having only a directive or objective force), compares with the Sansk. word dvish to hate.

The Latin however, it must be remembered, is essentially averse from aspirates. Many are the examples of their rejection in Latin, compared with equivalent forms in Greek and Sanskrit, as

LATIN.	GREEK.	SANSKRIT.
puto,	πυνθάνομαι (pure stem πυθ),	budh.
patior,	πάσχω, for πάθσκω, stem παθ.	bâdh.
crepusculum,	κνέφας,	kshapas.
carrus, a wagon,	———	char, to move.
domus,	δόμος,	dhâman.
fido,	πείθω (pure stem πιθ.)	bandh.
fugio,	φεύγω (stem φυγ).	bhuj.
sex,	ἕξ,	shash.

IV. Reduplication.

Reduplication, like nasalization, is a mode of strengthening the symbol of a thought, or thing. The use of strengthened forms was an early feature of language, abounding in the Sanskrit and Greek, and of frequent occurrence also in Latin; but occurring less and less in derived languages, as we get farther and farther from their primeval sources. As the Latin generally preserves, with the Sanskrit, more of the same simple strong characteristics, which they thereby both indicate to have belonged to their common mother-tongue, than does the Greek; its departure to a wider degree than the Greek from its original, in this respect, is to be ascribed probably to the direct practical tendencies of the Roman temperament, which did not relish double forms of the same thing, or multiplied modes of reaching the same end.

While human sensibility is instinctively averse from monotony, and the human organism generally recoils from mere iteration of any kind; there is yet manifestly a strong tendency, as appears not only in the first syllabication of infants, but also in the confirmed usage of all nations, to a repetition of the same consonantal sound in the utterance of many words, although the repetition is usually connected with some attending vowel-modification. The reiteration of a given sound intensifies it, as does that of a word or syllable, by not only drawing the hearer's attention to it more strongly; but also by showing that the speaker thinks, from his purposed repetition of it, that it deserves to do so.

Reduplication abounds in Sanskrit and occurs, as in Greek, in the present active of many verbs, and also in the preterite, as a sign of past time; and even a retriplication of the root sometimes occurs in Sanskrit, as bhibhibhid, from the simple base bhid to divide (German beissen, Eng. bite, cf. Lat. findo, as a strengthened form).

1st Reduplication in Greek.

(1) A reduplication of the stem occurs, as a mode of strengthening it, in the present tense, and those tenses which are derived from it, of some verbs.

Thus *γίγνομαι* (stem *γεν*) is for *γιγένομαι*; *μίμνω* (stem *μεν*) for *μιμένω*, and *πίπτω* for *πιπέτω*. So *τίθημι*, *δίδωμι* and *ἵστημι* are reduplications of the stems *θε*, *δο*, and *στα*. Other examples are such as *μιμέομαι*, to imitate; *μερμηρίζω*, to be anxious; *πορφύρω* (stem *φυρ*, to mix), to gleam, from which comes *πόρφυρα*, purple (referring to the constant play of light upon it); in all of which words, their own very repetitiousness of sound is a good image of the repetitiousness of the act, which they denote.

In such reduplicated words, the verb is strengthened in two ways: by the repetition of the stem itself as such, and also by the consequent lengthening of the verb-form as a form.

Some reduplications, in both Greek and Latin, manifest clearly a simple onomato-poetic origin, as mere syllabications, in human speech, of repetitious sounds previously heard in nature; as *μορμύρω*, Lat. murmuro, to murmur; *λαλαγέω*, to babble; *καχλάζω* (stem *χλαζ*), to dash or plash; so Lat. susurro (simple stem sur reduplicated), to whisper.

Of the reduplicated verbs in Greek, when not onomatopoetic, or, like *μερμηρίζω*, ideopoetic, it may be said, as of *δίδωμι*, *τίθημι*, etc., that they are among the most common words in the language; whose emphasis, being somewhat impaired by the constant familiarity of their use, is quite restored by the intensification of their form. Many also, if not most of them, are but copies of similar forms, in earlier languages, as *δίδωμι*, Sansk. dadâmi, and *τίθημι*, Sansk. dadhâmi.

An exhibition of the attending changes that occur, in some of the common instances of reduplication in Greek, will perhaps be of service. In *δίδωμι* (stem *δο*, Sansk. da) the reduplicated vowel *ο* is changed to short *ι*; so as to compensate for the added length of the word, and also so as to throw the reduplicated vowel into the shade, compared with the stem-vowel; while, similarly, in order to make the stem-vowel still more prominent, or to increase its relative, dynamical effect, as containing in itself all the sense of the verb, as such; as well as for the further purpose of preventing the concurrence of three short vowels; the short stem-vowel *ο* is lengthened into *ω*. The same analysis, step by step, will resolve the changes that have occurred in *τίθημι*, stem *θε*, except that, in addition to those made in *δίδωμι*, *θ* is changed, in the reduplicated syllable, into its corresponding smooth mute *τ*, as two initial aspirates cannot succeed each other in two successive syllables. Apply also the same analysis to *ἵημι*, stem *ἑ* (Sansk. yâ, to send away), and *βίβημι*, stem *βα* (Sansk. ga) as also in *βαίνω* for *βάνιω*), in which form the stem is nasalized. The form *ἵστημι* is for the more normal form *σίστημι*, and this for the fuller form still *στίστημι*, stem *στα*; with which compare Lat. sisto (for full form sistami) reduplicated from stem sta, as in sto, stare, Sansk. sthâ. In the reduplicated syllable (*ἵ*) of *ἵστημι*, two special changes have occurred: the dropping out of a radical letter of the stem (*τ*) and the exchange, as in so many other instances in Greek, of the initial sibilant for the aspirate. In *γίγνομαι* (stem *γεν*), for fullest unaltered form *γενγένομαι*, the final *ν* of the reduplicated syllable has been dropped, and the *ε* of the stem syllable (*γεν*) rejected, as in other reduplicated consonantal stems, as *πίπτω*, *μίμνω*, etc.; instead of being lengthened as in the vowel stems. In *πίπτω* for *πεπέτω* and *μίμνω* for *μενμένω*, there are the same changes as in *γίγνομαι*.

(2) The reduplication occurring in the form of the Greek perfect, consists regularly in doubling the initial consonant of the stem, with the vowel *ε* appended to it; which, unless it be the stem-vowel itself, as in *νέμω*, perf. *νενέμηκα*, is adopted

as a compensative shortening inwardly of the increased volume of the word outwardly, as in λέλυκα from λύω and γέγραφα from γράφω. If the reduplicated stem be a vowel-stem, as in the contract verbs, the final vowel of which is always short (on the principle that a vowel before another vowel is short), that short vowel is lengthened, as in τιμάω, τετίμηκα; φιλέω, πεφίληκα; δηλόω, δεδήλωκα. Unlike the augment, which is rejected in all the moods besides the indicative, reduplication is retained in them all. In stems beginning with two consonants or a double consonant, except a mute preceding either λ, μ, ν or ρ, the reduplication amounts only to the usual augment ε in form, as in ζώννυμι perf. ἔζωκα. Those beginning also with ρ prefix ε, and at the same time double the initial ρ, as in ῥίπτω, perf. ἔῤῥιφα. Such forms as ζέζωκα and ῥέριφα, however normal in their type, the Greek ear could not abide. Some few verbs also, instead of the usual syllable of reduplication, prefix ε lengthened into ει, as in εἴληφα perf. of λαμβάνω, instead of λέληφα (for the explanation of which see previous part of this Article, page 704 Vol. xvi. (1859).

In those few peculiar perfect forms, which change the stem vowel into an o-sound in reduplication, as ἔολπα perf. of ἔλπω, ἔοργα perf. of ἐργω, ἔοικα, of εἴκω and εἴωθα of ἔθω, the facts which at first sight appear to be so anomalous, are yet quite resolvable by analysis. Ἔλπω, ἔργω and ἔθω are each for *Fέλπω*, *Fέργω* and *Fέθω*, respectively; and their proper perfect forms for the second perfect tense, from such digammated originals, would be *FέFελπα*, *FέFεργα* and *FέFεθα*. With the digammas dropped, there would be a hiatus at once caused by two vowels of the same kind in conjunction, which was the most offensive form of hiatus to a Greek ear: a difficulty which could in no way be relieved so well, as by the change of η to ο; ε and η being compound vowels formed from *a*+ι (η differing from ε as having two measures of *a* in its composition, since ε is *a*+ι, and η is *a*+ι+*a*); while ο is a compound vowel also formed from *a*+υ. The vowel ο was as special a favorite with the Greeks, in changed forms and derived forms, as was the

vowel a with the Romans. The perfect *ἔοικα* from *εἴκω* to seem (from *εἶκος*, one with itself, likely; Sanskrit êkas for aikas one; Lat. aequus; cf. also *ἴσκω*, to make like, and *ἴσος*, equal), would be, reduplicated without change, *εἴεικα*. But the *ι* of the reduplicated syllable must fall out, by the rule that that must be shortened; and the *ε* of the stem-syllable *ει* is changed readily, as in so many other cases in Greek (as in the perfects of *μένω*, *δέρκομαι*, *λείπω* etc.), to *ο*. In the form *εἴωϑα* from *ἔϑω* for *Fέϑω*, we have such changes as the following from *FέFηϑα*, the unchanged normal archaic form: the change of the reduplicated vowel (*ε*), after the dropping of the digammas, into *ει* which, contrary to the usual rule, is the lengthening instead of the shortening of the vowel of reduplication, and which was probably done for the sake of adding strength to a base of so weak a consonantal character — *ϑ* (much weaker than any of the others enumerated); and the same phonetic instinct, which would suggest or rather demand the lengthening of the reduplicated vowel, would demand, for the preservation of the proper relative vowel-weight of the stem-vowel in the form, the lengthening of that also from *ο* as the new vowel naturally selected for it to *ω*.

The Attic reduplication, so called, differs from the common form of reduplication, in repeating the entire initial syllable, instead of merely the initial consonant with *ε*: the radical syllable also at the same time being emphasized, as such by the lengthening of its vowel, as in *ἀρήρωκα*, perfect of *ἀρόω*, etc.

2d. Reduplication in Latin.

This verbal affection is not of so wide a scope in Latin, as in Greek or Sanskrit. In Sanskrit, there are three distinct preterite forms: the first, answering in form to the Greek and Latin imperfect; the second, to the Greek perfect; and the third, to the Greek aorist. Yet neither one of these three perfects is generally used, to represent the completeness of an action; and their parallelism with the corresponding tenses named in Latin and Greek, is one of form instead of being one also of sense. The first preterite, like the Greek imperfect in form, is marked by the augment (*a*); the second, like

the Greek perfect, is marked by reduplication; and the third, like the Greek aorist, is marked by s and the augment.

In Latin the perfect and aorist are combined in the same form, commonly denominated the perfect, and discriminated in practice only by the sense of the context. While there are several modes of forming the Latin perfect — as by the use of the auxiliary verb,-fui, which is indeed the prevailing mode of forming it (being hardened in the first and fourth conjugations into -vi; and often also in the second, in which it is otherwise softened into -ui; and sometimes even in the third); and also by the addition of s to the verb-stem, as in the Sanskrit third preterite and Greek aorist, — many instances are found in the different conjugations, except the fourth, of its formation also by the reduplication of the stem.

A few instances occur in Latin of words possessing a reduplicated form, in themselves; as sisto, stem sta (cf. sto, stare); gigno, stem gen, (perf. genui); both of which verbs are causative in their force: sisto meaning to cause to stand, and gigno to cause to be, or become (*γίγνομαι*, stem *γεν*). So bibo has for its stem bo (cf. *πίνω*, stem *πο*, fut. *πόσω*); sero, for seso, (Gr. *σείω* and *σεύω*, to hurl about, Sansk. su and sû), has the stem se. Memini is a reduplication of the root men, to think (Sansk. man, as also in Lat. moneo. Cf. reminiscor, mens and Minerva, goddess of wisdom; and also *μνάομαι*, *μένος* and *μῆνις*) Populus is but plus (*πολύς* cf. *πλέος*) reduplicated, to signify a great number. Jejunus (cf. *ἰνάω*, to be empty and inanis) seems to be a reduplicated derivative from the same root with *ἰνάω*.

While in Greek the vowel of the reduplicated syllable is *ε*, it may be in Latin, as in Sanskrit, o or u; as in momordi, spopondi and tutudi, perfects of mordeo, spondeo, and tundo.

As the perfect denotes a past act, viewed as complete in present time, there is certainly a theoretic propriety, in expressing its sense by a reduplication; as the calling up of something already past into the present again, is making it repeat itself: appearing first in its own occurrence as a fact, and secondly appearing again in the announcement of it

anew to those, who did not see it themselves but who learn it from the testimony of another.

Before the light of Sanskrit philology was obtained, the Greek augment (ἐ) was analyzed by the best scholars, like Buttmann, as but a form of reduplication, shortened by the rejection of the initial consonant. But the discovery of the Sanskrit augment (a), as well as that of the reduplicated preterite in Sanskrit, dispelled at once such a theory.

In German, as in some English derivatives also from it, repetitious forms of words occur, which are instances indeed of reduplication, but which occur only in the lower strata of the language, as zigzag, hurly-burly, criss-cross, hurry-scurry, hocus pocus (hoc est corpus), helter skelter (hilariter et celeriter). Such forms have no grammatical or lexical significance of their own.

V. Nasalization.

The one letter most frequently used in all languages, to strengthen the stem of a word, is n; which contains in it also, because of its own phonetic strength, the idea of negation in all languages. Even our very words negation (ne+aio), and deny (de+nego), do but echo it again to us, as it appears in the words no, neither, nor, never, nay, not, none; Latin ne, non (archaic nenu), nullus (ne+ullus), nihil (ne+hilum), neuter (ne+uter), nunquam (ne+unquam); Gr. νη, μη; French ne and non; and German nicht (not), nie and nimmer (never), nein (no), and niemand (no one). So in Greek the same negative nasal appears in the preposition ἀνευ, without, and the abbreviated particles *ava*, ἀν- and the inseparable prefix νη-, which is but a strengthened form of *ava* abridged; and the Latin negative prefix in-; the German preposition ohne without, and the English prefixes of negation in- and un-. In Sanskrit and Zend we find na, not, and in Sanskrit also mâ and Persian me (Gr.

μη). N is a stronger nasal than m and is accordingly, as we have shown, the prevailing base of negative words in the different languages. There are properly three nasal liquids m, n, ng, which abound in Latin and Greek, as also in German and English. Examples of the nasal ng in Latin are ango, inquam, anxius; in Greek κλαγγή, ἄγγελος; and in English, anger, with which compare for difference of sound the word *singing;* in the pronunciation of which, the g-sound does not duplicate itself upon the next syllable. The soft sound of ng, in such words as singing, ringing, etc., occurs abundantly in German; and, while it is not found in Greek and Latin, it does belong to the Sanskrit.

Ng may be accordingly analyzed, as a guttural nasal, as in English longer, Lat. longus; and as a palatal or resonant nasal; and this of two kinds: hard, as in English words swinging and hanger; and soft, as in words strange and mangy. The English and French nch, as in Eng. haunch and French blanche, forms a dental nasal, as in German the word manch does a lingual nasal, where nch has a sound peculiar to that language. At the end of words in French, as in bon, bien, nom, n and m have a very light sound as palatal nasals.

The class of stems strengthened by nasalization, or by the insertion or addition of n to them, with or without an accompanying vowel, is that of verb-stems. The tenses thus strengthened are in each of the three classical languages, as a general fact, only the present and the derived tenses. In Latin however jungo preserves its nasalized stem throughout all its forms; with which compare the simple stem jug, as seen in jugum, and also both the strengthened and simple stems, as combined in ζεύγνυμι fut. ζεύξω etc. In Lat. words fingo, pingo, and stringo, the nasalized stem prevails throughout the verb, except in the supine stem.

The nasal is added to the stem in two ways, in reference to the place of its connection: (1) At the end of the stem. Specimens of its addition at the end of a vowel-stem are δύνω, κρίνω, τίνω, stems δυ, κρι, τι; and at the end of a consonantal stem are δάκνω, κάμνω, τέμνω, stems δακ, καμ, ταμ. As,

in Latin, cerno, sperno, and sterno are cases of metathesis, their simple roots being cre, spre and stra, they are not to be reckoned as verbs having consonantal stems. (2) In the middle of the stem; as, in Latin, in findo, fundo, linquo, pango, pungo, rumpo, vinco.

Roots are nasalized also in different modes and to different degrees, as to the volume and effect of the nasal addition made to their weight:

(1) By the addition of mere *ν* to them, which is the exclusive mode in Latin; as in *τίνω* fut. *τίσω*, *τέμνω* fut. *τεμῶ* for *τεμ(έσ)ω*.

(2) By adding *αν*, as in *δαρθάνω*, *αἰσθάνω*, *αὐξάνω*.

When the root-vowel is short, as in the stems *λαβ*, *λαθ*, *λαχ*, *μαθ*, *πυθ*, *φυγ*, a double nasalization occurs: the simple nasal *ν* being inserted before the final consonant as well as the nasal appendage *αν* after it; as in *λαμβάνω*, *λανθάνω*, *λαγχάνω*, *μανθάνω*, *πυνθάνομαι*, *φυγγάνω*. Here, as Curtius beautifully suggests, the nasal of the stem syllable is a sort of fainter phonetic reflection of the nasal ending added to it.

(3) By adding *νε*: as in *κυνέω* fut. *κυσω*; *ἱκνέομαι* fut. *ἵξομαι*; *βυνέω*, etc.

(4) By adding *νυ*. This class of strengthened verb-forms in Greek should be viewed, in connection with their equivalent forms in Latin: as

GREEK.	SANSKRIT.	LATIN.
ῥήγνυμι, for *Fρηγνυμι*.	bhanj and bhâj.	frango.
ζεύγνυμι (stem *ζυγ*.)	yu and yuj.	jungo.
πήγνυμι (stem *παγ*.)	paç,	pango.
σκέδαννυμι, (cf. *σκίδνημι*, *σχίζω* and *κεδάζω*.)	chid, and khid, to divide.	scindo.

In this class of verbs, while the nasal is inserted before the guttural in Latin, it is placed in Greek after it and syllabicated with a vowel, that it may be placed there.

All the vowel sounds are capable of receiving, in various modern languages, a nasal quality. In French we have a nasal a-sound, broad, and flat, as in ange and linge; and a nasal u-sound in both French (un) and Portuguese (um); as also a nasal o-sound in French (bon); and a nasal i-sound in Portuguese (im).

Nasalization, on a larger or smaller scale, is one of the inner forces to be found at work in all languages, ancient and modern, and occurring, not only in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, but also in the German and English.

B. The Latin.

1st. Benary's classification, in brief, of the fundamental principles of its special phonetic system.

After what has been said, in detail, in different parts of this Essay, on the phonetic elements and laws of the Latin language, it will not be necessary to enlarge the separate features of the general view, here furnished by Benary. The outline is indeed brief but comprehensive, and well worthy of study as a whole. The first half of the first volume published by him (in 1837), which is all that has yet appeared from his pen on the subject, is occupied with the subject of diphthongation; and the remaining half with that of aspiration.

These, then, are the special peculiarities of the phonetic system of the Latin, as grouped by him into one view, and are here thus formally quoted, on account of their value, as a group in one whole.

I. Disinclination to diphthongs.

II. The small range of aspiration.

III. The limited use of consonantal combinations, in initial and medial syllables.

1V. The counterbalancing influence of consonants and vowels.

V. The weakening of final letters, after consonants, as well as after vowels.

2d. The phonetic force of the Latin letters in alphabetic order.

A. This represents the Sanskrit a, and the Greek *α*, *ε*, and *η*.

(*α*) Sansk. sara, salt; ἅλς; sal.

(*ε*) ἔνος and ἐνιαυτός, a year; annus.

(*η*) ἅρπη, a sickle; harpa.[1]

[1] The *harp* gets its name from its being sickle-shaped; and it is of the same root with *harpoon* and the *harpies*.

In composition it is changed into the different vowels, e, i, u.

(e), inermis (in+arma); imberbis (in+barba); aspergo (ad+spargo). So even au may be changed to e, as in obedio (ob+audio).

(i) incido (in+cado); insilio (in+salio).

(u) insulsus (in+salsus).

In reduplicated forms it changes also in the tone-syllable, into e and i, as fefelli perf. of fallo, and tetigi and cecidi of tango and cado.

B. It is equivalent to the Sanskrit bh, b, g and p.

(b) bhû, to be, imperf. abhavam; -bam -bo, imperfect and future tense-suffixes, in the Act. voice of Latin verbs. So Sansk. barbara, foolish, barbarus.

(g) gô, gen. gavas, a cow; bos (*βοῦς*). G in Sanskrit is however more often represented by g in Latin than by b; while *β* occurs, as its equivalent, much more frequently in Greek than in Latin.

(p) plu, to move, to flow; bullo, to bubble; Gr. *βλύω*.

It represents the Greek *β*, *π*, *φ*.

(*β*) bos; *βοῦς*; bulbus; *βολβός*.

(*π*) bibo (stem bo, reduplicated); *πίνω* fut. *πόσω* (stem *πο*), to drink. So, buxus, the box-tree and *πύξος*. Compare in the same way in Latin publicus with its archaic form populicus from populus; and in German Burg, and in Eng. -burgh and burgher and burgess with *πύργος*.

(*φ*) Compare the following equivalent forms in the two languages: balaena, a whale, and *φάλαινα*; orbus, bereft, *ὀρφανός*, later *ὀρφός*; ambo, both, *ἄμφω* (cf. ambi- and *ἀμφί*); nebula, a cloud, *νεφέλη*.

Its changes in Latin are the following:

(1) Before the labial aspirate f, b passes sometimes into f, as offero for obfero; sometimes it changes into u, as aufugio for abfugio; and sometimes it is rejected, while its previous existence is recorded in the lengthening of the preceding vowel, as in āverto for ăbverto and āvello for ăbvello.

(2) Before s and t, it is commonly softened into p, as

scripsi perf. of scribo, and nuptus from nubo. In one case however it becomes s before si by assimilation, as jussi for jubsi, perf. of jubeo. In compound words, as obtendo, subtraho, etc., heterogeneous sounds are endured in combination in Latin contrary to the law of homogeneousness required in concurrent vowels so universally in Greek and occasionally at least in Latin.

C. Its equivalents in Sanskrit are ç, g, ch, h, k and v.

(ç) çana, hemp; cannabis, *κάνναβις*; çarnis, a horn, cornu (*κέρας*) : çarabha, a crab, carabus, *κάραβος*.

(g) gala, the neck; collum.

(ch) char, to go, and châras, a course; curro and cursus: chil, to cover; celo.

(h) hard, hrid and hridaya, the heart; cor(d) (*κῆρ* and *καρδία*) : hal, to hollow; coelum, (*κοῖλος*).

(k) karavah, a crow; corvus (*κόραξ*): kar and kri, to make, creo, to create, (cf. cresco).

(v) bhavayâmi (causative form of bhû, to be), I make; facio (for faciami): jiv, to live; vixi (for vicsi) and victum, perf. and supine of vivo.

C is equivalent to *κ*, *γ*, *χ*, *π*, in Greek.

(*κ*) caro, flesh, *κρέας*: cygnus, a swan, *κύκνος*.

(*γ*) conger, an eel, *γόγγρος* : caneo, to glisten, *γανάω*.

(*χ*) cedo, to depart, *χάζω* : corium, skin, *χόριον*: scindo, to divide, *σχίζω* : *cre*do, to believe, *χράω*.

(*π*) linquo, to leave *λείπω* : Cf. lupus, a wolf, *λύκος*.

In the Latin itself, c sometimes changes into g; as, contrarily, g sometimes becomes c. See the supines of verbs in -go, as cinctum, junctum, rectum, from cingo, jungo, rego, for the change of g to c; and for that of c to g, quadringenti, quingenti, etc., and negligo, negotium etc.

So long as the Latin remained pure, c had the hard sound of k even before the vowels e and i; and in later times, as we learn from Quinctilian, c was pronounced in such names as Caius and Cnæus, as G. No distinction in fact was made archaically between c and g; and c occupies the same relative position in the Roman alphabet that g does in the

Greek and Phoenician. The graphic symbol g was not introduced into the Roman alphabet, until five hundred years and more had passed from the founding of the city. Spurius Cervilius devised it (A. U. C. 523), in order to represent the medial guttural sound, for the soft sound of which c, as well as qu, both pronounced as k, were kept. Prodigium is accordingly for prodicium, from prodico, to tell beforehand; so congruo and ingruo, thought by many to be compounds of con and grus, in and grus, are probably but contracted forms of concurro and incurro; compare also dulcis and indulgeo. The fact that several words have double forms interchangeably in c and g, as vicesimus and vigesimus, -centi and -genti, in the various cardinal numbers for hundreds; and the change of c to g, in some compound words as negotium (nec- otium), or in derived ones, as digitus from root dic (cf. dico and disco Gr. δείκνυμι), shows that the sound of c wavered at times at least between k and g.

C, like g and like v also sometimes, combined with s is changed to x; while in some perfects in s the guttural entirely disappears, as in tersi from tergo for tergsi.

D. The equivalents of d are in Sanskrit d, dh.

(d) dam, to subdue; domo (cf. dominus and domina; Eng. dominion, domineer, domain, dame, dam, damsel, Madam).

(dh) dhâman, a house; domus.

Its Greek correspondents are δ, ζ, θ, σ.

(δ) δέκα, ten; decem.

(ζ) ζημία, damage; damnum.

(θ) Θεός, God, (Æol. Δεύς, cf. Ζευς, gen. Διός); Deus. (Cf. τίθημι, stem θε, Sansk. dhâ, German thun, Eng. do.)

(σ) μέσος, middle, medius. Cf. also ῥόδον and rosa, a rose.

Its peculiarities in Latin are the following:

(1) Before c, p, r, t, it is regularly assimilated to those letters, as in accedo, appello, arrideo and attendo. It is also

often assimilated before f, g, l, n, s; as in sella for sedla (for sedela), fossa for fodsa, agger for adger, etc.

(2) Before t, it changes in the middle of words by assimilation into s, as in rastrum for radtrum (from rado), and rostrum for rodtrum (rodo), and est 3d pers. sing. present of edo to eat, for edt. In some words, after the change of the d to s, the t wholly disappears, as in morsum (for morstum) for mordtum, from mordeo; and so pensum (for penstum) for pendtum from pendo; and risum for ridtum.

(3) In nominative forms d drops out before the gender-sign s, as laus for lauds, frons for fronds, pes for peds, vas for vads and lapis for lapids.

(4) D has wholly disappeared from the ablative singular of nouns where it once existed, as the case-characteristic of the ablative in all the different declensions; as in domino for dominod, sermone for sermoned: forms found in archaic inscriptions, which yet have left no trace of their previous existence upon the present state of the language, except in the prosodial fact of the elongation of the final vowel of the ablative, as in a, o, u and e terminal, of the 1st, 2d, 4th and 5th declensions.

(5) D, original in archaic forms, became afterwards sometimes l, as in lingua for dingua (cf. German zunge, Eng. tongue) and lacrima for dacrima (δάκρυμα). So compare levir and δαήρ for δα*Fήρ*, and Ulysses and *Ὀδύσσευς*. Compare also lignum, wood (for burning) and λιγνύς flame-smoke, with Sansk. dah, to burn and δαίω, to kindle.

(6) D followed by u in archaic forms was afterwards represented by b, as in bellum for archaic duellum; bis, archaic dvis (Gr. δίς for δ*Fίς*); and also bonus for duonus.

(7) Di and J were correlated in some forms in Latin; as Diana and Janus; dies, deus, Jovis and Juno. In the derived languages the Latin di is abundantly thus represented.

E. This letter represents the Sanskrit a, i, y.

(a) ad, to eat; edo.

(i) îr to go; erro, ἔῤῥω (cf. îra and ἔρα, the earth).

(y) yam, to obtain; emo (cf. νέμω).

It corresponds with ε and η in Greek.

(ε) *κέντρον*, a point from *κέντειν*, to prick; centrum (Eng. centre).

(η) *ἥρως*, a hero: heros.

In several words the double forms of the present and preterite roots, apparently occurring, by some inexplicable metathesis, within the bounds of the Latin itself, are wonderfully parallel with similar double forms of the same roots in Sanskrit: as cerno, perf. crevi (Sansk. kar and kri); sterno, perf. stravi (Sansk. star and stri). So compare Sansk. sarp and srip, to creep and Lat. serpo and repo.

E is often changed in Latin in compound and derived forms into i, o and u.

(i) pertinax (per+tenax); contineo (con+teneo)

(o) extorris (ex+terra); socius (sequor); sodalis (sedeo); toga (tego); vortex (verto).

(u) In genus (Gr. *γένος*, stem *γενες*) the proper stem of the word is genes and the present genitive generis is for genesis. In pulsus (part. of pello) for pelsus, for peltus, as likewise in sepultus part. of sepelio, and also in avulsus part. of avello and tugurium, from tego, we see similar specimens of the same change. E also interchanges sometimes with u in double forms, as dejero and dejuro, pejero and perjuro.

F. F represents several Sanskrit letters, as already shown under "Aspiration" (p. 839).

Its Greek equivalents are θ, χ, β.

(θ) fera, a wild beast; *θήρ*: ferveo, to be hot; *θέρω*.

(χ) fel, gall; *χόλος*: fatisco, to gape; *χατέω*. So compare frenum, a bridle, and *χαλινός*; and funis, a rope and *σχοῖνος*.

(β) fremo, to roar; *βρέμω*: fascino, to bewitch; *βασκαίνω*. Cf. also rufus and ruber, and French siffler with Lat. sibilare, as also Lat. frater and Eng. brother. It is sometimes hardened in derived forms in Latin into b; as in the suffixes -ber, -brum and -brium. Thus saluber (salus+fero) means literally *bearing* health; and candelabrum, a candlestick, is literally

something *bearing* a candle. Cf. likewise the imperfect and future tense-endings -bam and -bo, with the preterite suffix -ui and -vi (fui): all from same root as Sansk. bhû, to be.

G. The equivalents of g in Sansk. are g, gh, j, ç, h, y.

(g) gaudeo, to rejoice; garv: garrio, to chatter; grij, or grî: gilvus, yellow; gaura (cf. German gelb, Eng. yellow with gilvus).

(gh) ganea, an eating-house for gasnea; ghas, to eat.

(j) genu, the knee; jânu: gelu, cold; jalas.

(ç) gloria, glory and *inclytus*, renowned; çravas, (cf. Gr. κλέος for κλέ*Fος*).

(h) gena, the cheek (γέννς); hanu(s): so also ego (ἐγώ) and Sansk. aham (for agham): and nego (=ne+aio), to deny; ah, to say: and anguis, a snake; ahis.

(y) geminus, twin; yamas and yamanas, united, from yam, to unite (Gr. γαμέω)

Its correspondents in Greek are γ, χ, β, κ.

(γ) genu, the knee; γόνυ: gyrus, a circle; γυρός.

(χ) gutta, a drop; χέω fut. χεύσω, adj. χυτός: gero, to bear; χείρ: ango, to squeeze; ἄγχω.

(β) glans, an acorn; βάλανος.

(κ) guberno, to govern; κυβερνάω.

G becomes c before t, as in lectus and rectus for legtus and regtus. The law of homogeneousness in consonantal combinations prevails in the middle of words, in Latin as in Greek: smooth with smooth; middle with middle; and rough with rough, as scriptus for scribtus, etc. With a succeeding s, g becomes x, as in rexi (reg-si), maximus (magsimus); or disappears before s, as mulsi (for mulg -si). As an initial letter occurring in combination with other consonants, it is found only with l and r. Before n it has entirely disappeared from the beginning of many words once possessing it, as in navus (Fr. naïve) and nosco and nascor, originally gnavus, gnosco and gnascor; although it reappears again in compound forms, as ignavus (in+gnavus) and agnosco.

H. H represents Sansk. h; as hiems, wintry storm; himan (cf. χεῖμα): also veho, to carry; vah. Its equivalents in Greek are the aspirate, as horror and ὀῤῥωδέω; and χ, as hortus and χόρτος, veho and ὀχέω; hirundo and χελιδών. H is but a light breathing, and so light that two vowels enclosing it between them are affected by their juxtaposition, just as if it were wanting: the first being made short by the second, according to the usual rule, that a vowel before another vowel is short.

It changes before t into c; as tractus from traho and vectus from veho. So mactus agrees with Sansk. mah in its root; as do also magnus, magis and major, for magior (cf. μείζων for μέγιων).

The sign *H* was used as a sign to represent the aspirate by the Greeks, before being used, as it came to be in the end, as the sign for double ε, or η; and it was accordingly placed, at the outset, after the smooth mutes π, κ, τ, to indicate the aspiration of them, afterwards indicated by the symbols φ, χ, ϑ. When used as a whole simply to designate the vowel η, it was also divided and one half of the symbol H shortened for convenience into ʻ was used to denote the rough breathing; while the other half H shortened into the smooth breathing, and turned from the proper cursive direction of the letter, to indicate that its force did not go over upon it, was used to discriminate as such every initial vowel that was not aspirated.

I. and J. I is often the equivalent of the Sanskrit a, and i, and ê.

(a) ignis, fire; agnis: in, into and in; ana: imber, a shower; abhra: in*vîtus*, unwilling; vas, to wish.

(i) is, he; i, the demonstrative particle i (cf. also idem the same and Sansk. idam, he, it); eo, ire, to go; i, to go: viginti, twenty; vinçati.

(e) vitis, a vine; vêtra, a reed.

J is equivalent to Sansk. y, as jungo, to join; yu and yuj: juvenis, a youth; yuvan.

The Greek correspondent of j is ζ, which was not pro-

nounced, as commonly in this country, as if ds, but as dsh or j or zh; and the ancients spoke admiringly of its soft liquid sound.

I in compound and derived forms in Latin is often substituted for other letters, as for a, ae, e, o and u. It is the substitute of a in incĭdo (in+cado); ae, in incīdo (in+caedo); e, in retineo (re+teneo); o, in illico (in+loco); u, in consilium (from consulo) and exsilium (exsul). I represents the short vowel-sounds in Greek *a*, *ε*, *o*. (*a*) digitus; δάκτυλος: catinus, a bowl; κάτανος. (*ε*) piper, pepper, πέπερι. (*o*) canis gen. canis, a dog; κύων, gen. κυνός.

J sometimes falls out of the middle of words as in obex for objex (objicio) and aïs, 2d pers. present of aio, or ajŏ, for ajis. J is the consonantal counterpart of the vowel i, as v is also of u.

As the Greek *υ* was pronounced like the French u, the corresponding vowel of Latin forms, from the same root as Greek forms containing it, takes i in its place, to which the short French u-sound is very similar. The letter y accordingly has received from this fact the alphabetic name y Grec, in French.

K. K was employed in the earliest period of the Latin, as the equivalent of the Greek *κ*; at which time c represented the Greek *γ* in sound as well as in its alphabetic place and its symbolic form (inverted). When subsequently a new symbol for g was invented, c supplanted k in use; and k in consequence fell into disuse, except in a few abbreviated forms as Kal. for calendae, etc.

L. L is equivalent to Sanskrit l, n, r. d.

(l) labor, labi, to fall and labo, āre; lab and lamb: libet and lubet, it is pleasing; lubh: ligo, to bind; lig.

(n) alius, another; anyas.

(r) lyra (Gr. λύρα prob. at first λύδρα; ru, to sound forth and rudrî, an instrument): laedo, to injure; radh; lateo, to be concealed; rah, (cf. Fr. rossignol and lusciniolus). So the terminations -alis and -aris are radically the same.

(d) lignum, wood (to burn); dah, to burn: levir, a

brother in law (Gr. δαήρ for δαFήρ); dêvri : mel, honey; madhu. So lingua was originally dingua. Cf. also the double forms in Greek δάφνη and λάφνη, a laurel, and Lat. oleo, to smell and odor; also, Lat. amylum, starch and Fr. amidon.

As l could not remain doubled at the end of a word, it was removed, in the nominative, from the end of the stems mell, honey, and fell, gall.

M. M has for its Sanskrit equivalent m. Cf. machinor, to contrive, etc.; Sansk. mah (Gr. μηχανάομαι, Eng. make, Fr. maçon, Eng. mason.

M interchanges with n, as immanis and immitto for inmanis and in-mitto. M also corresponds as a final letter, in the declension of both verbs and nouns, with ν[1] in Greek (Sansk. m); since the Greek ear would not tolerate m, at the end of words. Before s, it is assimilated in one case to s; as pressi, perf. of premo, for premsi. Usually when m and s would occur together in the perfect of verbs, p is euphonically inserted between them, as prompsi, perf. of promo (=pro+emo): and sumpsi perf. of sumo (=sub+emo). Cf. for similar epenthesis of p in French, dompter, to subdue (Lat. domitare), and in English tempt (Lat. tento).

M interchanges in Latin in some instances with b and v, as hibernus (hiems) and promulgo for provulgo; with which compare also globus and glomus.

N. The Sansk. equivalents of n, are n, sn, jn.

(n) neo, to spin and necto, to connect together; nah, to knit: nasus, the nose; nâsa(s).

(sn) no, to swim, and nato; snâ: nix, nivis, snow; snavas (from verb snu, to pour forth).

(jn) nosco (for gnosco), to know; jnâ.

N in Latin corresponds sometimes with τ in Greek; as pinus, a pine, Gr. πίτυς: planus, broad, Gr. πλατύς.

In composition with l and r, n is assimilated to them, as

[1] So in French also, m often changes to n, as colonne, a column (columna); sentier a path (Lat. semita).

colligo for conligo and corruo for conruo. So also ullus is for unlus, for ununlus; and corolla for coronla for coronola. Before s, as in trans, n often disappears, as in trado (trans +do), traduco, and traho, and tracto its derivative (supposing traho to be for tra+veho). So in elephas (for elephants) and gigas (gigants), and adamas (adamants), the letters nt have been dropped out before the gender-sign, as always in Greek [1] when the gender-sign is retained. The disappearance of n, in the perfect and supine forms of verbs, which contain it in the present and imperfect tenses, as in fundo, pungo, tàngo, is not, of course, to be explained, as a matter of euphonic necessity or convenience. Such verbs have their pure stems, which are found, as in Greek, in the preterite tenses, nasalized in the present and imperfect tenses, as likewise in the Greek in both voices.

Other words besides verbs are sometimes thus strengthened in Latin, as ambi (*ἀμφί*) Sansk. abhi; and inferus, sup. infimus; Sansk. adhas, low, comp. adharâs, sup. adhamas.

O. O is equivalent to Sansk. a, â, âu.

(a) os(s), a bone; asthi.

(â) vox, voice; vâch(s).

(âu) octo, eight; ashtâu.

Its correspondents in Greek are *ο*, *ω*, *ε*.

(*ο*) nomen, a name; *ὄνομα*. (*ω*) ago; *ἄγω*. (*ε*) oliva, the olive, *ἐλαία*, and oleum, oil, *ἔλαιον*.

O is frequently interchanged with u in derived forms: as sermunculus, diminutive of sermo(n); exsul (ex+solum); cultum (sup. of colo); robur, gen. roboris; publicus (for populicus) from populus; vult (for volit) from volo; and also homo and humanus. So, the ancient name of Modena was Mutina.

It sometimes interchanges with e, in the same word, as

[1] When such a combination would occur in nominal bases as *νs*, *ντs*, or, *ρs*, in Greek, the rule is, if the gender sign is retained, to reject the other letters of the combination as *γίγας* (*γίγαντs*); or, to reject the gender-sign and keep final *ν* or *ρ*, and lengthen the vowel preceding it, by way of compensation, as *ποιμήν* (*ποιμένs*); *ῥήτωρ* (*ῥήτορs*).

vertex and vortex (verto); vester and voster (vos). It is in derivatives sometimes changed to i, as in cognitus (cognosco).

By way of adding more weight to the stem-vowel, other vowels, and especially e, are changed to o, in derived forms, as so often occurs also in Greek: as socius (from sequor); sodalis (sedeo); procus (precor); solium (sedeo); modus (metior); nodus (necto). These changes occur chiefly, in both Latin and Greek, in the case of nouns[1] derived from verbs.

P. Its Sanskrit equivalents are p, v, b. (p) palus, a marsh; palvala(s): pingo, to paint; pij and pinj. (v) porcus, a pig; varâha(s). (b) puto, to consider; budh: pestis, a plague; bâdhâ.

P, when initial, can be followed only by l and r of all the consonants. Its euphonic insertion between m and s, in perfect and supine forms, has been already described. Its Greek correspondents are π, ϕ, τ, κ. (π) palma, the hand; $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta$. ($\phi$) pars, a part, $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\sigma\circ\varsigma$, from $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega$, to divide. ($\tau$) pavo, a peacock; $\tau\alpha\acute{\omega}\varsigma$. ($\kappa$) lupus, a wolf; $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\circ\varsigma$.

P is interchangeable in Latin with b,[2] as scripsi perf. of scribo; with v, as opilio and ovilio[3], a shepherd from ovis, a sheep; and with t, as hospes and hostis, each having for their primary signification, a stranger.

Q. Q and qu represent Sansk. k, ch, p, ç. (k) quis, who; kas: quatio, to shake; kvath, to agitate. (ch) coquo (for poquo), to cook; pach (cf. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\omega$ for $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omega$): quæro for quæso, perf. quæsivi; chesth, to seek. (p) quinque, five, panchan ($\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\epsilon$): (ç) equus, a horse; açvas.

---

[1] In German, and correspondingly in English, there are many instances of a change of the stem-vowel of verbs, to indicate distinctions of time.

As, singen, to sing.	Imperf.	sang.	Past	Part.	gesungen.
" stehlen, to steal,	"	stahl.	"	"	gestohlen.
" sprechen, to speak.	"	sprach.	"	"	gesprochen.
" binden, to bind.	"	band.	"	"	gebunden.

[2] So, Latin apotheca becomes, *vice versa*, French bontique.

[3] Cf. Lat. pauper and French pauvre; and also German vater and Lat. pater.

Its correspondents in Greek are π, as sequor, to follow; ἕπομαι: and τ, as quis, who; τις (for κις). With reference to the interchangeableness of q, or any other guttural, with p, or any other labial, in Sanskrit or Greek, compare with other examples previously cited, proximus (for propsimus); vixi (vivsi) and nix (nivs). So tabeo, to pine away, corresponds with τήκω and French suivre with Lat. sequi.

Qu is not a diphthong in Latin, as in German and English. It had only, as in French, the simple sound of k. The vowel u was added, simply to make it capable of articulation. In early forms a similar combination of u with g occurred, as tinguo, unguo and urgueo, first forms of tingo, ungo, and urgeo. So in French we find guérir, guider, etc.; and in English, guide, guard, etc.

Q in qu, before another u and also before t, becomes c; as secutus for sequutus (sequor) and secundus for sequundus. So is it with relictus from relinquo and coctus from coquo and concutio for conquatio and cujus, gen. of quis (for quojus). In one word, inquilinus for incolinus, a reverse change occurs; and in quum with its double form cum, we have two different spellings of the same word with the same pronunciation.

R. Its equivalents are in Sanskrit r, l; and various consonantal combinations with r, as pr, dr, sr, kr.

(r) res, a thing; ras: rex, a king; râj: rodo, to gnaw; rad: rheda, a carriage, rathas.

(l) rumpo, to break; lup and lump.

(pr) re- and red- back; prati.

(dr) racemus, a cluster of grapes; draksha(s).

(sr) rivus, a brook (cf. ῥέω for σρέϝω); sru, to pour forth.

(kr) rideo, to laugh; krîd.

Before s, r is sometimes rejected, as lepus for lepors (o being also euphonically changed to u); flos for flors, mus for murs; pulvis for pulvers; cinis for ciners; in which cases s is the gender-sign. So hausi perf. of haurio is for haursi and haesi for haersi. But in such neuter forms as jus, corpus, foedus etc. the s is to be analyzed as a substi-

tute for r: and radical r is accordingly often changed to s, before nominal and adjective suffixes; as flosculus for florculus and corpusculum for corporculum; scelestus for scelertus and rusticus for rurticus: while before t, especially in supines, radical r often becomes s; as gestum for gertum (gero), questus for quertus (queror) and ustum (uro) for urtum.

R is often assimilated before l and s: as puella, for puerla for puerula; libellus for liberlus; and pellucidus for perlucidus: as also gessi for gersi (gero) and ussi (uro) for ursi.

It is sometimes inserted into words by epenthesis, as in sero perf. sevi (Gr. *σείω*, Sansk. su, German saën) and in the genitive plurals of nouns -arum, -orum, -erum for aüm, oüm, eüm, Gr. *αων* etc. So brachium compares with Sansk. bahu and frango with bhanj.

R is often the representative of an original s in Latin: as ara for asa; eram for esam quorum for quosum (Sansk. kâsâm) dirimo for disemo; diribeo for dishibeo. So compare nasus and naris. In German and English likewise r and s often interchange: as German war, frieren, hase, eisen; Eng. was, freeze, hare, iron.

S. S represents Sansk. s, ç, ch, sv, ksh. (s) scando, to climb; skand. (ç) saccharum, sugar; çarkaga. (ch) *obscurus* (*σκιά*, *σκοιός* and *σκότος*); chhâyâ. (sv) soror for sosor, a sister; svasri and svasar. (ksh) sipo, to cast away; kship.

The correspondents of s in Greek are the aspirate, as super and *ὕπερ*; *σ*, as studeo and *σπεύδω*.

In some cases s initial is found in roots wanting it in Greek, as scalpo and *γλύφω*, scruta and *γρύτη*; and, vice versa, it is not found in some roots where in Greek it does occur, as fallo and *σφάλλω*.

S is dropped in the nominative from the end of any stem, where it would otherwise be doubled, as as (for ass) gen. assis and os (for oss) gen. ossis. It is also often dropped in the middle of compound words as diduco, dimico, divello for disduco etc.

For the interchange of s and r, see letter r.

S is assimilated before f, as differo for disfero; and it assimilates to itself in many cases, a preceding b, d, m, r, t, as jussi (for jubsi), cessi (cedsi), pressi (premsi), gessi (gersi), confessus (confetsus, for confettus).

S sometimes represents in Latin an original d, as esca and esculentus and est, he eats, from edo, to eat, for edca etc. So in Greek *ἐσθίω* and fut. *ἔδομαι* compare; as also Lat. rosa and *ῥόδον* and Sansk. madhyas and *μέσος*.

T. The Sanskrit equivalents of t are t, st, sth, dh. (t) tendo, to extend; tan. (st) tono, to thunder; stan (cf. *Στέντωρ*, famous for his loud voice). (sth) taurus, a bull; sthiras. (dh) terra, the ground; dhara.

Its Greek correspondents are *τ*; and *θ*, as vestis; *ἑσθής*, etc.

T is assimilated to s, as quassi perf. of quatio for quatsi and missum for mitsum (for mittum). T is also often suppressed before s, as in the nominatives mors, mens, dos, for morts, ments, dots and the perfects misi, sensi for mitsi and sentsi. T becomes sometimes d in derived forms, as quadra and quadraginta from quatuor, and so mendax, deceitful from mentior, to lie.

In the middle of a word before two vowels the first of which is i, t was in the later period of the Latin language pronounced with a sibilant sound, as is evident from the double spelling ci and ti used in such cases, as in nuntius and nuncius.

U and V. U represents Sansk. u, v or kv and a. (u) sub, under (*ὑπό*); upa. (kv) ubi, where, for cubi, as in alicubi (alius+cubi, or ubi); kva.

U is sometimes hardened into its corresponding consonantal form v, as gavisus, perf. form of gaudeo. Sometimes it is shortened into e or i, as bacillus, dimin. of baculus (for bacululus); and so tabella (for tabulula) dimin. of tabula; and familia formed from famulus. Other vowels frequently change in derived forms to u, but u seldom

changes to them as in cultum sup. of colo; insulto and exsulto from salio, compounded with in and ex.

The equivalents of v in Sanskrit are u, v, b, k. (u) vacca a cow; ukshan, an ox from vah, to carry. (v) veneror, to worship: van; via, a way; vah, to go. (b) valeo, to be strong; bala, force. (k) vermis, a worm; krimi.

Its correspondents in Greek are the digamma *F*, as vinum (*οἶνος* for *Fοῖνος*); and *β*, as volo (*βούλομαι*).

V is properly a labial differing from f, only as being somewhat harder. The two sounds compare phonetically, as in English the two sounds of th, in think and rather, or bath and bathe. After a vowel and before a consonant, especially t, it changes often into u, as lautum for lavtum (lavo), nauta for navta; cautum for cavtum. And so also, vice versa, after a consonant and before a vowel or t, it changes into u, as docui for docvi and solutum for solvtum. In some words v drops out and the previous vowel is lengthened as votum supine of voveo, for vovtum and oblītus, part. of obliviscor, for oblivtus. In a few cases it is changed, in combination with s into a guttural, as vixi, victum for vivsi and vivtum from vivo; and nix (for nivs) gen. nivis. In forms like jūvi, fōvi, mōvi, cāvi etc., there is a contraction of the full original forms, which were juv-vi (juv- being the verb stem and -vi the tense-ending, composed of the tense characteristic v and the person-ending i), and fŏv-vi, mov-vi, cav-vi etc. V, when occurring in a syllable which was afterwards contracted, changed to u, as neu for neve, seu for sive, nauta for navita.

X. Its Sanskrit equivalent is ksh as axis (*ἄξων*), an axletree; aksha: and its Greek correspondents are *ξ* and, in proper names sometimes, *σ* and *σσ*: as sex, six; *ἕξ*: Ajax and *Αἴας*, Ulixes and *Ὀδυσσεύς*.

X represents, as a compound consonant, cs, gs, and sometimes vs, ps and ts.

(cs) vox: (gs) rex: (vs), connixi perf. of conniveo for connivsi and fluxi perf. of fluo, for fluvsi: (ps) proximus, superlative of propior, for propsimus: (ts) nixus for nitsus from nitor.

In one word at least the use of x seems to be altogether arbitrary; senex, gen. senis. The author can think of no euphonic analysis that will explain it.

X in the preposition ex changes into f by assimilation before f, as effero etc.

The change of x to ss or sc is noticeable in a few words, as lassus (for laxus) and lascivus (for laxivus).

Y. This letter was not introduced until a late period into the Latin alphabet; and it was then confined to words borrowed from the Greek, in which *υ* had been previously used. As the Greek *υ* was in pronunciation the modern French u, its representation by y in Latin, in the middle of words, was very natural.

Z was borrowed from the Greek, and used only to denote foreign words.

No one who has not undertaken to compass the whole subject of phonology, for himself, in its many internal elements and external relations; and to subject its facts and difficulties to a thorough analysis of his own; and to adjust the results of his manifold investigations in all their separate and combined aspects into a harmonious scientific system, adequate to the wants of so great and so complicated a subject, — can have any just idea of the amount of earnest, varied and repeated thought and research required for its proper development. No one will welcome more gladly than the author, the sound of another's blast, drill or hammer, in these vast and but partially worked mines of scholarly exploration. His own effort has been, to throw a true and strong light on matters hitherto lying out of the field of scholastic vision, in this country; and to him who shall give them a brighter and fuller illumination, no one shall shout with more gladness: All hail!

Erratum. — On page 691 (Vol. XVI.), of previous article, lines 2 and 30, for word dadâmi, I place, read dadhâmi.

ARTICLE VI.

A JOURNEY TO NEAPOLIS AND PHILIPPI.

BY HORATIO B. HACKETT, D. D., PROFESSOR AT NEWTON.

[*Prefatory Note by the Editors of the Bib. Sac.* — The Book Notices which have been prepared for our present Number, we have chosen to defer, in order that we may publish the following valuable narrative, which, although accessible perhaps in another form, will yet be new to our readers; and which, being peculiarly appropriate, has been specially revised and enlarged, for this Periodical.]

It was the writer's original plan to travel by land through Macedonia from Thessalonica to Neapolis, and thus visit the several places in that country (Philippi, Amphipolis, Apollonia are the others), which Luke has mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. The principal object, however, was to see Neapolis and Philippi, and so much the more because they lie considerably aside from the ordinary route of travellers, and have seldom been described by persons attracted to them as places of biblical interest. On arriving at Thessalonica, on the 6th of December, 1858, it appeared necessary to modify this plan in part. The lateness of the season presented unforeseen obstacles. The rains had been uncommonly abundant, and had flooded the country. The streams were swollen, and many of the bridges swept away. The Turkish post between Thessalonica and Constantinople had recently been more than a week behind its time. Individuals, whose judgment I was not at liberty to disregard, advised me against this undertaking. Not to fail wholly in my purpose, therefore, I concluded to return to Volo in Thessaly, near the ancient Iolchos, and cross by steamer to Neapolis, on the other side. The passage occupies, usually, twenty-four hours; but a storm overtook us, and the voyage proved to be more than twice as long. We remained ten hours in one position off against Mount Athos, without making the least head-way.

The engine was powerless against the combined force of the winds and waves, and no harbor was within reach which it was deemed prudent to attempt to enter. Towards the close of the second day the storm abated, and the captain took shelter for the night under the lee of Thasos. A run of two hours the next morning brought us into the port of Kavalla, the ancient Neapolis.

Arrival at Kavalla.

Roumelia, which includes the ancient Macedonia, is a Turkish province, and does not excel in all the arts of civilized life. It was a pleasant relief, after a brief experience in the best khan (*ξενοδοκεῖον* or *κατάλυμα*, as the Greeks term it) which the place afforded, to be invited by the English vice-Consul, Frederick Maling, Esq., to make his house my home during my sojourn in that region. It is not enough to say that this gentleman treated me with as much kindness as if I had been one of his own countrymen ; for I know of no title with which one stranger can approach another which could have procured for me a heartier welcome, or a more generous hospitality, than I received from him. It becomes me, at the outset, to make this acknowledgment, and to say, further, that I am indebted to his intelligence for hints and information which were invaluable to me in the prosecution of my inquiries.

I arrived at Kavalla in the forenoon of Saturday, December 11. A general survey of the place and the making of arrangements for the expedition to Philippi occupied the remainder of the day. The town is built on a rocky promontory, which juts out from the coast of Roumelia into the Aegean. The harbor, a mile and a half wide at the entrance and half a mile broad, lies on the west side. The more prominent geographical features are the range of hills on the west, known to the ancients as Symbolum, which come down near the shore, and connect transversely the eastern end of Pangaeus in the south, and the opposite end of Haemus, or Rhodope, in the north. Back of Symbolum lies the Plain of Philippi, flanked on the right and left by the other ranges just

named. Mount Athos, the Aghion Oros (*Ἅγιον Ὄρος*) of the present Greeks, is conspicuous in the south-west. The land along the eastern shore is low, and otherwise unmarked by any peculiarity. Samothrace, in the same direction, can be seen when the atmosphere is clear. The island of Thasos bears a little to the southeast, twelve or fifteen miles distant. A post-road passes through Kavalla to Constantinople, eastward, and to Drama and Thessalonica, westward. The further details will be more in place hereafter.

Historical Associations.

I assume here, for the present, that Kavalla is the Neapolis mentioned in Acts 9 : 14. Here Paul and his associates, Silas, Timothy, and Luke, landed in Europe on their progress to the west as heralds of the gospel. They proceeded from here, over Symbolum, to Philippi, and thence onward to the south of Greece. Paul traversed the same ground again on his second visit to that country, and on his return from Corinth, on his last journey to Jerusalem, came once more to Philippi, and embarked at Neapolis for the opposite shores of Asia. The historian of the party shows a peculiar interest in the Macedonian labors of the apostle. It is observable that Luke, who became his companion at Troas, drops the first person in the narrative at that place, and does not resume it again till he comes to the account of their sailing thence for the last time. It is possible that he himself spent the interval between the apostle's first and second Grecian tour in that city. It is certain that he dwells upon the events there with something like the partiality of a favorite theme. The most graphic chapter in the book, unless we except the account of the voyage to Rome, is unquestionably that which relates to Philippi and the occurrences there. The church which Paul was instrumental in planting in that city was preëminently distinguished for its purity and its efficiency. The name of Philippians has been rendered memorable forever by the loving epistle which the great apostle addressed to them. It is evident from its contents that no one of the primitive churches enjoyed so much of his confi-

dence and affection. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written in Macedonia, and in all probability at Philippi. Nor had the sound of Paul's footsteps hardly ceased to be heard here, before Macedonia was honored with the presence of another of the faithful witnesses. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, passed through this region on his way to Rome, where he was to be thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre. Having crossed from Troas to Neapolis, he proceeded to Philippi, and thence onward, by the Egnatian Way, to Thessalonica and Dyrrachium, where he took ship again and went forward joyfully to meet his fate. Such recollections exalt the interest of a visit to such places, infinitely above the attraction of "all Greek, above all Roman fame." I cannot doubt that I shall have the reader's sympathy in the attempt to bring up afresh this scene of apostolic energy and self-denial and triumph.

Excursion to Philippi.

I took the earliest opportunity to make the proposed excursion to Philippi. Mr. Maling, who had been there several times and was familiar with the ground, was one of the party. A Greek friend, a Macedonian by birth, who had accompanied me from Athens, went with us. On Monday, about ten in the forenoon, we started from Kavalla. The present route must be the ancient one, for it is evidently the shortest route between the two places, and crosses the hills at the only point where a passage could be easily effected. Just out of the gate, on the west of the town, we crossed a stream which came down from the right, and, at the distance of a few rods, emptied into the harbor. On the bank stands a magnificent plane-tree (πλάτανος), the unmistakable age of which must cover no small portion of the interval between our own days and the days of the apostles. The present trunk measures thirty-three feet in circumference, and when perfect must have been forty feet or more. It is partially decayed now; and the hollow, as was evident from the blackened sides, has been used as a shelter for the be-

nighted or the houseless.[1] A recent flood had swept away the bridge over the stream, except a single arch, and had borne the fragments into the sea.

Crossing of Symbolum.

For fifteen minutes after this the paved road runs quite near the shore. We passed a Gipsy settlement, within view, on the right. We begin then to ascend, and are climbing the eastern side of Symbolum. Near the commencement of this ascent the track of an older road turned off to the left, towards the sea; but, as I afterwards ascertained, left that direction, and, near the top of the ridge, fell again into the road which we pursued. Another stream was dashing wildly through a ravine on the left, along the side of which the present road is constructed. As we mounted higher the air became colder; and the country people, whom we met on the way to market, had their capotes drawn closely about their heads. A thin soil covers the rocky hills, supporting little more than thorny shrubs, a few wild olives and stunted oaks, and a plentiful crop of ferns and mosses; some of the last exceedingly rich and delicate. Looking back when about one third of the way to the top, Kavalla, with its port, made a fine appearance; and the summit of the promontory on which it stands, seemed directly opposite to us. The more open spots, which looked toward the sea, are thickly strewn with large bowlders, thrown into every variety of position, as if just left there by the refluent waves. Symbolum, according to captain Graves, is 1670 feet high; but the road is somewhat lower, as it passes through a gorge with overhanging heights on the right and the left. We reached the watershed in thirty minutes from Kavalla. That town disappeared then, and the prospect was cut off both towards the east and

[1] A distinguished botanist (Prof. Gray, of Harvard College), informs me that a plane-tree of this description cannot be less than five hundred years old. There is another tree of the same species, almost as large, near the principal mosque in the town. It is still vigorous, and bids fair to run the race of other centuries. The plane-tree at Kephissia, on the way to Marathon, which has been so much admired, has a girth of less than thirty feet.

the west. It proved, however, to be a few rods only across the ridge; and soon another scene opened suddenly upon us. First, the snowy peaks of Pangaeus in the south-west, and those of Haemus in the north and north-west, rose up majestically before us. A few steps further, and the entire Plain of Philippi and its grand amphitheatre of hills, the acropolis and the ruins at its base, were before our eyes, as if a curtain had been drawn aside in a moment by an enchanter's hand. I reserve a more particular description of the view from this point for a subsequent paragraph. The Pieric Valley, which leads down to the coast between Pangaeus and Symbolum, was very distinctly visible. It surprised me to see a collection of water in that part of the Plain almost large enough to be called a lake. The declivity on this side is more abrupt than on the other. The descent to the border of the Plain occupied twenty minutes. The paved road here, from the nature of the ground, must follow the ancient Roman Way; though, in consequence of having been repaired so often, it may not be easy to distinguish the work of one hand from that of another. The hills jut out somewhat beyond each other; so that, after reaching the bottom, we advanced, for a time, under the shoulder of a ridge on the left. The mountains which slope down from the north, reminded us strikingly of those of Hymettus. They presented the same puffed-out, swelling forms so characteristic of the Attic scenery.

Plain of Philippi.

The road, after striking into the Plain, was much less perfect than it had been hitherto. The soil is too soft to allow the stones to be laid firmly; in some places they were gone altogether, and in others submerged beneath the mud and water. Yet the track could be easily traced, and the pavement reappeared every now and then. We passed several flocks of sheep and goats, intermixed, as represented in the parable. The abundant rain had so flooded the fields that the peasants, in some instances, were sowing them a second time. At half past eleven, A. M., we reached a large Turkish cemetery, which contained many monuments, of which the

material was antique. Some of them were marble pillars at the head of the graves, with the end wrought into the turban-shaped figure with which the Turks so often embellish their tombs. Many such pillars were lying on the ground; other more ordinary stones, taken evidently from buildings, were used for the like purpose. Latin letters, and occasionally single words, could be deciphered on the fragments. The great marble quarry in this region is the island of Thasos. The specimens here may have been obtained, originally, from that source, but were the immediate spoils of the fallen Philippi.[1] Nearly off against the cemetery, toward the middle of the Plain, was the Turkish village of Bereketli, which signifies "Plenty."

Ancient Monument.

In fifteen minutes beyond this cemetery we came to a khan, kept by a Greek family, where we stopped a quarter of an hour. Here is a large monumental block of marble, called in Turkish, *Dikili-tash*," "Upright stone," twelve feet high and seven feet square. It rests on a plinth, composed of two pieces of the same kind of marble. It appears to be the base or pedestal of some structure which originally stood upon it. It has a hole on the top, which may have been designed for the reception of a statue. There is an inscription on two sides, in large Latin letters, of which the names "Caius Vibius et Cornelius Quartus" are nearly all that can now be made out. The lower part of the block is mutilated, and the fresh color of the surface showed that pieces had been recently chipped off. We were informed that the Turks have a superstition that the stone, pulverized and taken as a potion, is a valuable specific, and that they seek it for that pur-

[1] I have since read that Belon, a French traveller, who was here in the sixteenth century, observed a vein of marble near Philippi itself. He would account in that way for the abundant use of this stone in the city and the environs. Paul Lukas, another and later French traveller, thought he could distinguish different kinds of marble, and conjectured that the better species was brought from Thasos. He also speaks of a quarry in the hill near which Philippi was built.

pose. The Greek innkeeper told us, also, that the cavity on the top was the crib (φάτνη) out of which Alexander's horse Bucephalus, was accustomed to eat his oats.[1]

Near this khan is another cemetery, full of fragments of marble columns used as grave-stones. On the opposite side is a cluster of beautiful shade trees; and on the same side, at a greater distance, a mill, to which the water is conveyed through a flume from a sedgy pool in the neighborhood. The stream rushed along its channel with great violence. In the same direction, beyond the mill-race, are seen the ruins of a fortification on a slight eminence, which may have been some outpost of Philippi. The time from this point to the site of the ancient city was twenty minutes. There is no human habitation, in any direction, nearer the site than this caravansary. Beyond here, the indications of approaching an important locality are more and more numerous. Slabs of marble, broken columns, and chaplets, building stones, heaps of rubbish, attest the suburban extent of the town, though no doubt some of these remains have been brought hither from the town itself.

River near Philippi.

Luke states in the Acts (16 : 12 sq.), that Paul and his companions, after being a few days at Philippi, "went out of the gate by a river side," and, sitting down there, spoke the word to the Jewish proselytes, who had a place of worship on the banks of the river. The expression implies that the stream flowed near the city; that they had only to pass out of the gate,[2] and were then shortly at the spot which they would reach. Many of the streams in the East are transient; they are full

[1] This story has at least the interest which arises from its having been repeated on the spot through successive generations. Belon was entertained with the same pleasantry, two hundred and fifty years ago.

[2] The Common Text has πόλεως (and so the English version "city"); but Lachmann and Tischendorf adopt πύλης, as do most of the recent commentators. The authorities are A B C D and the principal Versions. The laws of textual criticism require us to accept πύλης as the word from the first hand. Yet the remarks in the body of the page are scarcely less in point, if any one chooses to adhere to the other reading.

and swollen during the rainy season, but disappear in summer.[1] Mr. Maling had been there several times in the hot months, but found the water-course always dry. I was not without hope that the lateness of my journey would enable me, as one of its compensations, to see the river or stream (ποταμός), in our sense of the expression, which Luke speaks of as being near Philippi, and which travellers have so generally missed. Yet the subject, as we approached the ruins, had passed for a moment from my mind. I was intent on gazing at the memorials of the past heaped up before me; and the lower ground, directly under the line of the ancient walls, was not yet in sight. Suddenly, as we drew nearer, a roaring noise broke upon me; there was no visible cause for it; it seemed almost as if some convulsion of nature was at hand.[2] A few steps further, and the mystery was cleared up: there, rushing and foaming over its rocky bed, was a wild winter torrent, which had been formed by the recent rains. The proper bed of the stream measured, in width, sixty-six feet. One-half of this space was covered with water, varying from one and a half and two feet to four and five feet. The stones at the bottom were rounded and worn, and showed the action of a still more powerful current at times. Its course was winding as it ran past Philippi; and it is evident that the direction of the walls had been adjusted to that of the stream. It skirts the east or south-east side, and then trends off to the south-west. It forms a moderate cascade just below the ruins, and empties, in all probability, into the marsh or lake which is so conspicuous towards the west end of the Plain. It may be conjectured that, in ancient times, the banks off against the city were walled up, as is seen to be the case, under similar circumstances, elsewhere; so that the water was

[1] As late in the year as the second week in November, I walked dry-shod along the water course of the Ilissos, from a point opposite the Acropolis to its entrance into Phaleron. There was only one place where it was necessary to turn aside, and then in order to avoid a quagmire, and not from any fear of being drowned.

[2] The noise was not unlike that of the well-known 'Ain el-Fîjeh, which bursts forth at the base of one of the mountains of Anti-Lebanon, and which the traveller approaches so suddenly through a dense plantation of fruit-trees.

spread over less space, but formed a deeper channel.[1] We crossed the stream; and, at the distance of three hundred and fifty feet from its margin, found a break in the line of the dilapidated walls, which showed clearly where the gate had been on that side of the city. Travellers from Neapolis would enter that gate as we did in coming from the same place. Paul and his company must have entered the town here. It may be supposed to have been out of this gate that they passed when they went to preach on the river-side; for the place on the banks, as remarked already, was near the gate, and situated as Philippi was, no other gate would have brought them so directly to the river as this. It will be seen that this vicinity of the stream and the gate tallies remarkably with the sacred text. It seemed to me, at the moment, to be one of the most beautiful topographical confirmations that I have ever traced out in sacred or classic lands.

The Present Ruins.

We were now within the limits of the ancient Philippi. Deducting the time for delays, we had been a little more than two hours on the way. Our pace had been faster than that of Eastern travelling, as usually performed; and it may be correct to reckon the distance between Kavalla and Philippi

[1] The stream is no doubt the Gangas, or Gangites (*ὃν Γάγγαν τινὲς, οἱ δὲ λέγουσι Γαγγίτην*), which Appian (*Bell. Civ.*, iv., 106), describes as near Philippi. It is impossible that this river should be the Strymon, which was a day's journey further west. It is surprising that such writers as Neander, De Wette and Meyer should have fallen into that error. Luke omits the name in conformity with a very common usage of those countries. I found, in repeated instances, that the people are accustomed to speak of a stream in their neighborhood merely as the stream or river, and often are unable to tell the stranger whether it has any name or not. I incline to think that we have an intimation here that the critics are right who suppose that Luke staid at Philippi until the Apostle's second arrival here. Being an inquisitive man, as we know from the proem of his Gospel, no doubt he sought out the name of the river on his first arrival, when his curiosity was still fresh; and had he afterwards remembered the place merely as a traveller, he would have been led quite naturally to insert the name when he wrote his history. But if, on the contrary, he was there so long that his ear became accustomed to the popular expression "the river," "water," "stream," it is then conceivable that when he came to write out his memoranda or recollections he would pass over the name, and speak unconsciously as the old habit dictated.

as ten miles.[1] So many writers speak of a village on the spot, known still under the ancient name, that my first feeling was one of disappointment to find that this is no longer true, if, indeed, it has been true for these many years.[2] There was no sign of any human abode within the precincts of the ancient city. There is no village nearer than Bereketli, and that must be some miles distant. The old name is applied, no doubt, to the locality among the people, but on traditionary grounds, and not because Philippi has any modern representative.

The present scene is one of utter desolation. It reminded me (though on a smaller scale) of the promiscuous heaps of Ascalon. The ruins are spread over an extent of several acres. The course of the wall may be followed very distinctly on the side towards the river. The remains of an amphitheatre are seen on the sides of the overhanging hill, where it looks southward towards Pangaeus. The seats are quite perfect, and rise above one another in tiers, as in the Dionysiac theatre at Athens. On some of the stones are inscriptions: a few in Greek, but mostly in Latin. Philippi became a Roman colony in the age of Augustus, and is so represented (*κολωνία*) in Acts 16:12. The chiselled words which the stones found on the spot have borne down to us from that age, certify the same fact. The most imposing antiquities there, are two lofty gateways, supposed to have belonged to a colossal temple of the emperor Claudius. They stand near each other, *vis-a-vis;* may be forty feet high; contain stones twelve feet long and four feet thick, and are constructed with exquisite taste and elegance. One of them is much shattered, and looks as if nodding to its fall. There is a Greek inscription on one of the displaced stones, which imports that the people (*ὁ δῆμος*) defrayed the expense of some votive offering in

[1] Mr. Maling on one occasion accomplished the journey in an hour.

[2] Even Meyer, in the last edition of his *Commentar über den Philipper-Brief*, 1858, speaks of the village *Fellibah*, as on the ancient site. Winer (*Realwörterbuch*, ii., p. 249), makes the same representation, and Alford after Winer. Yet Cousinery wrote thirty years ago: "La ville célèbre de Philippi ne renferme aujourd 'hui, que des animaux Sauvages; l 'oiseau de Minerve s'y régénère au milieu des débris."

honor of one of the citizens. There are several parallel trenches walled up with stone, which are evidently ancient. Fragments of pottery are scattered everywhere. But few pieces of marble are now to be found. On the west side of the city is a mill-race, no longer used, into which are wrought some finely hewn stones, which must have adorned a Greek or Roman edifice.[1]

The acropolis, at the base of which the ruins lie, is said to be two thousand feet high. It is the last of the hills where Haemus sinks down into the Plain, and is connected with them by a narrow ridge, of inferior altitude, on the north. It consists of two peaks, which, as seen at a distance, give to it a saddle-shaped appearance. Several walls, at different degrees of elevation, guarded the summit. On the top are the ruins of fortifications, which show the traces of Roman masonry. It reminds one, in its general contour, of Acro-Corinth, though it is not isolated, like that, nor so huge in its proportions. It is difficult of access, and must have been almost impregnable against the ancient modes of assault.

The summer vegetation had nearly all passed away. A solitary rose[2] still lingered on the sunny side of the hill, where the amphitheatre[3] is, and a few pinks hung partially withered on their stalks. Some plots within the area had been sown

[1] Belon, whom I have mentioned already, spent two days at this locality. It is evident, as one reads his description, that the ruins were vastly more extensive and complete then than they are at present. He speaks of a great number of statues; there is not one there now. The superb marble columns, both of the Doric and the Ionic order, which he mentions, all are gone. The remains of the temple are very insignificant, in comparison with those which he saw. He represents the inscriptions as very numerous. I could find but one which was at all complete. Unsparing depredations have been committed there within a few years. A mercantile company, at Thessalonica, which bears an English name, is said to have removed a large quantity of the material to Kavalla, for the erection of a warehouse. The remonstrance of some more liberally minded foreigners put an end to the Vandalism. A Byron's pen is needed again to expose the outrage to the indignation which it deserves.

[2] The ancient naturalists speak of the rose of Pangaeus as a much admired flower.

[3] Travellers describe it variously as a stadium, theatre, amphitheatre. Though much smaller in all respects, it appeared to me to resemble the theatre at Argos, or the Dionysiac theatre at Athens.

with winter grain, which was just beginning to appear. A portion of the ground was converted into a range for cattle. The stubble of the last year's harvest showed that everything was exacted of the soil, which it could be made to yield. On the banks of the Gangas was a cluster of mulberry trees, the branches of which had been cut off for the sustentation of the silk-worm.

On descending into the plain, we had ceased to feel any inconvenience from the cold, and during the greater part of the day found the air to be delightfully mild and balmy. For a short time only, at noon, was the heat oppressive in a slight degree. The striking contrast between such a temperature and the sight and vicinity of mountains glittering with fields of snow and ice, was not unlike that which presents itself to the traveller as he looks towards the Apennines from the Campagna, or towards Lebanon from the valley of the Bukâa.

Reading of the Epistle to the Philippians.

Before leaving the scene, I sat down upon one of the prostrate columns and read the Epistle to the Philippians. The recollections, the place, the circumstances, brought home to me the contents with new vividness and power. I had just traversed the road by which Paul and his associates approached the city. The gateway where they entered was within sight. I could hear the rushing of the stream upon the bank of which Paul declared the name of Jesus and rejoiced over his first converts on a new continent. On my left passed the Egnatian Way, along which Epaphroditus, the bearer of the epistle, hurried with tidings of the apostle from his cell at Rome. The silent Stadium lay before me on the hill-side, of which his illustration reminded the Philippians, as he held up to them his own example for imitation in striving for the βραβεῖον, the imperishable crown, which is to reward the Christian victor. Within the space under my eye must have stood the house where the first disciples were gathered for worship and called on the name of Christ. One of the mounds around me may have been the

ruins of the prison which resounded with the praises of Paul and Silas, and which the earthquake shook to its foundations. I thought especially of the moment when the following great words were read and heard here for the first time, and of the myriads since that moment whose souls those words have stirred to their inmost depths, in all generations, and in all parts of the earth: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father." One could not, under such circumstances, repress a new and yet more ardent prayer that the day of this universal recognition may soon come, and, in the meanwhile, that the spirit of the sublime passage may pass more fully into the lives of those who profess and call themselves Christians.

A Remarkable Tomb.

Though the lengthening shadows (*majoresque . . . altis de montibus umbræ*) admonished us to be gone, one object of interest still remained which claimed attention. About two miles from the ruins (I may err in the precise distance), off to the left from the line of the road to Kavalla, is a marble sarcophagus, which is well worth seeing. It stands on the edge of one of the roads which intersect the Plain. It is a solid block, except the immense lid or roof, twelve feet long outside, eight and a half high, and six feet wide. A great part of one of the sides has been broken away, and a hole laboriously opened at the upper corner of another side. Such mo-

nolythic sarcophagi are found in other parts of Greece.[1] The Greek and Turkish inhabitants have an idea that treasures were concealed in them; and the mutilated state in which they are found is to be ascribed, no doubt, to an attempt to get possession of the coveted riches. The reports of earlier travellers show that such monuments were formerly numerous here; but this is the only one of which I heard as still remaining.

A Night Journey.

The twilight was nearly past when we set forward again. The return to Kavalla was a night journey. The moon shone dimly and a few stars only appeared, owing to a hazy atmosphere. We saw occasionally shepherds gathered around their watch-fires, while their flocks were folded near them in the *mandra* or wicker inclosure constructed for that purpose. We were soon mounting the western acclivity of Symbolum. The stillness was unbroken save by the clatter of the horses' feet on the old pavement. The appearance of Kavalla, as seen through the shades from the brow on the other side, unenlivened except by two or three solitary lights, made on me a sad impression. The clear voice of the muezzin, as he proclaimed the hour of prayer from the mosque, was distinctly audible while we were yet on the mountains. We were not surprised that the gates of the town were closed for the night at so late an hour.[2] The consul despatched a messenger to the military governor; and, in the mean time, we betook ourselves to a neighboring khan, where we were glad to feel the warmth of a cheerful fire. An unexpected piece of good fortune awaited us here. In digging for the foundations of a house near there, a relic of antiquity had just

[1] Konze (*Reise auf den Inseln des Thrakischen Meeres*, 1860) describes a similar one, which he saw in the Island of Thasos. He also mentions the popular belief alluded to in the page above.

[2] This incident is liable to occur often in the course of oriental travel. It illustrates the origin of John's image of the heavenly city where all is peaceful and secure; where "there is no night, and the gates are not shut at all by day." All time is day there, and the dangers which night brings are unknown.

been turned up, at a depth of some fifteen feet below the ground, which the master of the establishment had in his possession. It was a marble tablet, quite perfect, on which was sculptured a group of female faces, singularly elegant and expressive. One value of the discovery was, that it served to strengthen the manifold evidence that an ancient people inhabited this spot, who were not strangers to the classic form of culture. The order to open the gate soon arrived, and thus closed a day which had fulfilled one of the most earnest wishes of my life.

Neapolis Identified.

It may be as well, at this stage of the narrative, to pause a moment on the question whether there can be any reasonable doubt, that the present Kavalla occupies the site of Luke's Neapolis. The majority of the earlier and later writers affirm this question; while a few dissent still from that conclusion. Of those who deny the identification in question, the most important representatives are Cousinéry, for many years French consul at Thessalonica, and the author of a valuable book of travels in Macedonia;[1] and Tafel, a German scholar, the author of a very able work on the Egnatian Way.[2] I propose to mention, briefly, the reasons which support the claim of Kavalla to be regarded as the ancient Neapolis; and, on the other hand, the arguments which are urged in favor of Eski (or Old) Kavalla, a harbor ten or twelve miles further west. To satisfy myself on this point was one of the objects which led me to undertake the journey.

First, the Roman and Greek ruins at Kavalla prove that a port existed there in ancient times. Neapolis, wherever it

[1] *Voyage dans la Macedonie*, Paris, 1831.

[2] *De Via Militari Romanorum Egnatia, qua Illyricum, Macedonia, et Thracia jungebantur, Dissertatio Geographica.* Tubingæ, 1842. Mr. Howson (*Life and Letters of Paul*, Vol. I., p. 338), says, inadvertently, that Tafel agrees with Dr. Clarke and Colonel Leake in placing Neapolis at Kavalla. Tafel opposes that view, and contends at length for the other opinion. See his work (*Pars Orientalis*), pp. 14, *seq.* Forbiger also identifies Neapolis with Eski Kavalla, in his *Handbuch der alten Geographie*, iii., p. 1070, but in Pauly's *Real Encyclopädie* (v., p. 487) appears to follow Leake.

was, formed the point of contact between Northern Greece and Asia Minor, at a period of great commercial activity, and would be expected to have left vestiges of its former importance. Kavalla fulfils entirely that presumption. Fuller evidence of this remark (some I have given already) will appear in the sequel. On the contrary, no ruins are found at Eski Kavalla, or Paleopoli, as it is also called, which are unmistakably ancient. No remains of walls, no inscriptions, and no indications of any thoroughfare leading thence to Philippi, are reported to exist there. Cousinéry, it is true, speaks of certain ruins at the place, which he deems worthy of notice; but according to the testimony of others these ruins are altogether inconsiderable, and, what is still more decisive, are modern in their character.[1] Cousinéry himself, in fact, corroborates this testimony, when he says that on the isthmus which binds the peninsula to the main land, *on trouve les ruines de l'ancienne Néapolis ou celles d'un château reconstruit dans le moyen âge.*"[2] It appears that a mediaeval or Venetian fortress existed there once; but, as I was credibly informed, nothing else has been discovered, which points to an earlier period.

Secondly, the advantages of the position render Kavalla the probable site of Neapolis. It is the first convenient harbor south of the Hellespont, on coming from the east. Thasos serves as a natural landmark. Tafel says, indeed, that Kavalla has no port, or one next to none; but that is incor-

---

[1] Cousinéry was at the spot a short time only, and was hurried away before he could make the investigations which he had proposed. Colonel Leake did not visit either this Kavalla or the other, and his assertion that there are "the ruins of a Greek city" there (which he supposes, however, to have been Galepsus, and not Neapolis), appears to rest on Cousinéry's statement. But as involving this claim of Eski Kavalla in still greater doubt, it may be added that the situation of Galepsus itself is quite uncertain. Dr. Arnold (note on *Thucyd.*, iv., 107), places it near the mouth of the Strymon, and hence much further west than Leake supposes. According to Cousinéry, Galepsus is to be sought at Kavalla. Rawlison (*Herodotus*, iv., p. 103), remarks incidentally, that it lies eastward of the Strymon, between Phagres and Oesyma.

[2] On p. 119 he says again: "Les ruines de l'ancienne ville de Nêapolis se composent principalement des restes d'un château du moyen âge entièrement abandonné et peu accessible."

rect. The fact that the place is now the seat of an active commerce proves the contrary. It lies open somewhat to the south and southwest, but is otherwise well sheltered. There is no danger in going into the harbor. Even a rock which lies off the point of the town has twelve fathoms alongside of it.[1] The bottom affords good anchorage; and, although the bay may not be so large as that at Eski Kavalla, it is amply large enough to accommodate any number of vessels which the course of trade or travel between Asia Minor and Northern Greece would be likely to bring together there at any one time.

Thirdly, the facility of intercourse between this port and Philippi shows that Kavalla and Neapolis must be the same. The distance is ten miles, and hence not greater than Corinth from Cenchreae, and Ostia from Rome. Both places are in sight at once from the top of Symbolum. The distance between Philippi and Eski Kavalla must be nearly twice as great.[2] Nature itself has opened a passage from the one place to the other. The mountains which guard the Plain of Philippi on the coast-side fall apart just behind Kavalla, and render the construction of a road there entirely easy. No other such defile exists at any other point in this line of formidable hills. It is impossible to view the configuration of the country from the sea, and not feel at once that the only natural place for crossing into the interior from the coast is this break-down in the vicinity of Kavalla.

Fourthly, the notices of the ancient writers lead us to adopt the same view. Thus Dio Cassius says (*Hist. Rom.* xlvii. 35) that Neapolis was opposite to Thasos (*κατ' ἀντιπέρας Θάσου*), and that is the situation of Kavalla. It would be much less correct, if correct at all, to say, that the other Kavalla was so situated, since no part of the island extends so far to the west.[3] Appian says (*Bell. Civ.* iv. 106) that the camp of the

[1] See Purdy's *Sailing Directory for the Mediterranean*, p. 152.

[2] The inspection of any good map (as, for example, Cousinéry's), will justify this estimate. I have not ascertained that any traveller has gone over the ground between the two places.

[3] Pococke, who passed along the coast, describes the position of Thasos in

Republicans, near the Gangas, was nine Roman miles from their triremes at Neapolis[1] (it was considerably further to the other place), and that Thasos was twelve Roman miles from their naval station (so we should understand the text); the latter distance appropriate, again, to Kavalla, but not to the harbor further west.

Finally, the ancient Itineraries support entirely the identification contended for. Both the Antonine and the Jerusalem Itineraries show that the Egnatian Way passed through Philippi. They mention Philippi and Neapolis as next to each other in the order of succession; and since the line of travel which these Itineraries sketch was the one which led from the west to Byzantium, or Constantinople, it is reasonable to suppose that the road, after leaving Philippi, would pursue the most convenient and direct course to the east which the nature of the country allows. If the road, therefore, was constructed on this obvious principle, it would follow the track of the present Turkish road, and the next station, consequently, would be Neapolis, or Kavalla, on the coast, at the termination of the only natural defile across the intervening mountains. The distance, as I have said, is about ten miles. The Jerusalem Itinerary gives the distance between Philippi and Neapolis as ten Roman miles, and the Antonine Itinerary as twelve miles. The difference in the latter case is unimportant, and not greater than in some other instances where the places in the two Itineraries are unquestionably the same. It must be several miles further than this from Philippi to Old Kavalla, and hence the Neapolis of the Itineraries could not be at that point. The theory of Tafel is, that Akontisma or Herkontroma (the same place, without doubt),[2] which the Itineraries mention next to Neapolis, was at the present Kavalla, and Neapolis at Leuter or Eski Ka-

relation to Kavalla in precisely the same way as Dio Cassius describes that of Neapolis and Thasos. See his *Travels*, Vol. II., p. 148. This agreement, in the mode of expression, as Pococke has no reference at all to the present question, confirms our inference from the language of the Greek historian.

[1] The camp, it is to be borne in mind, was a little further toward the coast than Philippi.

[2] See Hoffman's *Griechenland und die Griechen*, Band I., p. 125.

valla. This theory, it is true, arranges the places in the order of the Itineraries; but, as Leake objects, there would be a needless detour of near twenty miles, and that, too, through a region much more difficult than the direct way. The more accredited view is that Akontisma was beyond Kavalla, on the way further east.

Antiquities at Kavalla.

The antiquities of Kavalla, as I have intimated already, show conclusively that it must have been the site of a Roman or Greek city. One of the most imposing objects, among the first to attract the voyager's eye at sea, is a massive aqueduct, which brings water into the town from a distance of ten or twelve miles north of Kavalla, along the slopes of Symbolum. It is built on two tiers of arches, a hundred feet long and eighty feet high, and is carried over the narrow valley between the promontory and the main land. The upper part of the work is modern, but the substructions are evidently Roman, as is seen from the composite character of the material, the cement, and the style of the masonry.

Three or four miles from the town, on this water-course, are two other aqueducts, of much smaller dimensions. Just out of the western gate is a well, with a curb-stone indented with marks of the rope in drawing, such as the use of centuries only could produce. Near there are two marble sarcophagi, used as watering troughs, on which are Latin inscriptions, from the age of the emperor Claudius. In the stable of a khan, also outside of the town, are more than a dozen stately columns, two of them of elegant Ionic workmanship, which would be worthy of attention at Athens or Corinth.

A Winter Scene.

On one occasion I followed the course of this aqueduct for several miles. It was a frosty morning, and the Turkish fountain, on the neck between the promontory and the main land, was covered with thick ice. Beyond here the hills curve in-

ward to the left; the aqueduct runs along the side of them, for the most part on the surface, but occasionally sunk a little below it. Several streamlets descend from above, and pour a part of their contents into the channel. In two instances, within the limits of my walk, the conduit crossed deep ravines, spanned by arches forty paces long. It is impossible that the fountain-head should be on Pangaeus, as some of the books represent; for instead of going to the south-west, as would be necessary in that case, the aqueduct runs in just the opposite direction, i. e. north-east. The scene was thoroughly a winter scene. Thasos appeared white to the very shore. All the standing collections of water within sight were sheeted with ice. Immense icicles were hanging from the arches of the aqueduct. The thermometer was four degrees only above zero, and, before night, fell to zero. The streets of Kavalla were almost deserted. The people, who are much more sensitive in this respect than those of higher latitudes, cringed before the cold, as if it was piercing them to the quick.

The preceding winter had been one of uncommon severity. Even Symbolum was covered with deep snow. Several inches fell in the town itself. The road between Neapolis and Philippi, and thence onward to Thessalonica, became for a time impassable. Shepherds and travellers were frozen to death, and the flocks were destroyed in a frightful manner. The houses are poorly constructed for such weather, and the suffering of those within door, at such times, cannot be slight.

Paul in Macedonia.

There is no evidence that the apostle Paul ever travelled further north than Macedonia. Some of the hardships which he recounts he suffered from cold and want of raiment (*ἐν ψύχει καὶ γυμνότητι* in 2 Cor. 11 : 27). He may possibly have had some experience of this nature in this precarious climate. To such trials he must have been still more exposed during his travels among the highlands of Asia Minor,

if he was there in winter. It is very possible that his first sojourn in Macedonia, and perhaps a part of his second, fell in that season of the year. The apostle arrived in that country on his second visit early in the summer; for, remaining at Ephesus until Pentecost (as may be inferred from 1 Cor. 16: 8), and tarrying for a short time at Troas (2 Cor. 2: 12, 13), he then proceeded directly to Macedonia. But as he went, at this time, westward as far as Illyricum (Rom. 4: 19), and as he spent but three months at Corinth before his return to Macedonia at the time of the Pentecost (Acts 20: 6), he must have prolonged his stay in northern Greece into or through December. It is certain, at all events, that the rigor of a severe winter here is great enough to occasion no ordinary amount of personal suffering.

Discovery of New Ruins.

On one of the afternoons while I remained at Kavalla, the consul, who had several times applied for the favor without success, sent to the military commander of the town and obtained permission for us to visit the citadel. It is situated on the highest point of the promontory, and commands, in a military point of view, the city, the harbor, and the pass on the west, which was the key between Thrace and Macedonia. Several cannon are planted there, stamped with the winged lion of Venice, and among them a French piece, bearing the date of 1665. An old magazine contains a large stock of spears, arrows, and other antiquated weapons of the Middle Ages. One of the most interesting objects is a subterranean excavation, divided into compartments, like cisterns or baths, and resembling Roman works of that nature. Pieces of marble and a prostrate pillar indicate that a better style of architecture existed there once than the unsightly piles of stone and mortar which have taken its place.

On descending from the citadel we paid a visit to the governor of the city. Knowing the interest of travellers in objects of antiquity, he mentioned to us that excavations were then going on in connection with a house once occupied by

the Venetian governors, which had brought to light some curious ruins. We were not slow to act upon this suggestion. The place to which we were directed was in the upper town, and not far below the fortress. The ancient house was to be rebuilt; and some adjacent walls had been demolished, and the foundations turned up for the purpose of securing a proper basis for the new structure to be reared upon them. It was evident that some splendid edifice of the Graeco-Roman period had stood upon this spot. Many large blocks of marble were lying there, which the workmen had just dug out of the ground. The fragments of building-stones were numerous. Two or three pillars with the Ionic frieze, had been found beneath the rubbish. One such column maintained its upright position, imbedded still to a great depth in the earth. In a neighboring stable was a series of carefully hewn blocks, some of them thirteen feet long, and one and a half and two feet thick, resting to all appearance upon their original foundation; while other ancient stones had been placed upon these by later hands. On several of the stones are inscriptions, mostly in Latin, but one at least in Greek,[1] so mutilated or illegible as to furnish no connected sense, though single words are entirely distinct. There is part of a Roman arch in the wall which separates the upper and the lower town from each other; and on the opposite sides of the gate which leads into the fortress, or upper town, are two ancient columns, some twelve feet high.

Track of an Old Road.

I have mentioned that the present road to Philippi follows a slightly different track from an older one on the eastern side

[1] No traveller, as far as I am aware, speaks of having noticed any Greek inscriptions at Kavalla. Dr. Clarke says expressly, that none had been found up to the time of his visit. But even if Neapolis was founded in the Roman age, Greeks must have constituted a part of the population; and some trace of that fact might be expected to be found among the existing relics. The Greek inscription to which I refer is on the face of a block, wrought, at present, into the wall of a Turkish house near the excavations. It appears to have been what we should call a victualler's sign-board. It mentions the proprietor's name and occupation, and sets forth the variety and excellence of his viands.

side of Symbolum. I went out, one forenoon, for the purpose of ascertaining more exactly the relation of the two roads to each other. The deviation begins near the bottom of the ascent. I left the new road there on the right, and, turning down nearer to the shore, crossed on the hard sand and the stones, the stream which comes down the mountain through a deep and wild ravine. The entire object in changing the course of the road, appears to have been to bring the road from the left side of this ravine to the right, and thus secure a more direct line of travel. Just beyond here, after beginning to ascend, another smaller stream issues from the heights, and supplies a Turkish fountain at the foot of the hill. The country, just here, was wild in the extreme. Not a single tree, properly so called, unless a dwarfish wild olive should be excepted, diversified the landscape. Thorns, shrubs, and moss-covered rocks, were all that met the eye. The harbor as viewed here, in consequence of a slight projection of the shore, appeared like the figure of a heart. Still higher up, a bridle-path struck out to the left, toward Eski Kavalla, or Leufteropoli, or Paleopoli (as it is variously called); but, though I pursued it for a considerable distance, I could find no trace whatever of any ancient road in that direction. The old paved way, instead of inclining longer toward the sea, turned, after a time, to the right, or east; and, though the stones sometimes disappeared almost entirely, could be made out till it became manifest that the old and the new tracks fell into each other at the head of the ravine, near the water-shed. This result is one of some importance, as showing that Neapolis could not well have been at Eski Kavalla; for a road, in that case, must have been constructed along the coast to the present Kavalla, which, if it was not Neapolis, must have been, at all events, one of the stations on the route from Philippi to the east.

An Unexpected Sight.

I then went forward a little distance beyond the point of junction between the roads described above. Kavalla disappeared, and Philippi had not yet come into view. It oc-

curred to me whether, by ascending one of the heights which overlooked the road, it might not be possible to see the two places from the same position. I am not aware that any traveller has spoken of this possibility. It seemed more than probable that some intervening peak, on the right hand or the left, would intercept the view, and so disappoint my hope. The experiment was made, and the result was one of the most gratifying incidents of the journey. It was not necessary to go very high up; one of the lower heights afforded the wished-for sight. Kavalla and Philippi could be seen, in their opposite directions, from the same spot. I am sure that a person standing there could interchange signals between the two places with entire ease. I felt, more strongly than before, how natural it was to regard the city and its port as one; to speak of landing at Philippi, though the disembarkation took place at Neapolis; or of sailing from Philippi, though the sea was ten miles distant.[1]

The panorama spread out before me, as I looked towards the Plain, was diversified and extensive. The prominent figures were the mountains, which stretch away toward the north and the north-west to an indefinite extent, the Haemus range, and, nearer at hand, in the south-west, Pangaeus, which forms a distinct chain; the former more lofty, and, in the distance, opposing to the eye an unbroken region of snow; and the latter, more sharply defined, and thrusting its snow-capped summits against the clear sky with a most imposing effect. The outlet of the Plain around the foot of Haemus, where Philippi stood, in the direction of the conterminous plain of Serres, was the only very noticeable interruption in the circuit of hills which otherwise inclose the great battle-field.

The marsh, into which flow the waters of the Plain, seemed to extend almost from the site of Philippi to the opening between Pangaeus and Symbolum.[2] Trees, meadows,

---

[1] So familiar was this identification to Luke, that he leaves the verb which describes the voyage from Troas to Neapolis (*εὐθυδρομήσαμεν*), to describe the continuance of the journey from Neapolis to Philippi. See Acts, XVII., 11.

[2] This lake or marsh is not a perennial one. Appian says (*Bell. Civ.* IV .,106), that it existed at the time of the battle of Philippi, and was not without its influ-

and fields, recently sown, skirted its border. Other collections of water sparkled in the sunlight at different points. The village of Bereketli appeared to be near the centre of the valley. Several hamlets could be distinguished at the base of the opposite mountains, and others on the sides of them. Detached farm-houses were scattered here and there. The contrast between the vegetation and fertility here and on the other side of Symbolum was very marked. The shrubbery was more abundant and fresher, the trees larger, fields were green with winter grain, and farms or plantations were set apart for cultivation at the proper season. The atmosphere being very clear, it was possible to distinguish even the smaller objects. Among the ruins at Philippi, the gates of the temple were visible to the naked eye. The fortifications on the acropolis stood out in bold relief. A glass enabled me to discover the solitary sarcophagus on the edge of the Plain. Turning to the east, the view was an extended one of land and sea. Within the field of vision were Kavalla, its towering promontory, the harbor, Aghion Oros or Athos in the south-west, and Thasos, Samothrace, and a long line of coast in that direction.

Farewell to Philippi.

It was hard to tear myself from the scene, and say the last word of farewell to a place endeared to the hearts of Christians through so many generations. I looked and lingered, was anxious to secure the last conscious view, and yet would avoid it. But the reluctant step must be taken. I raised my eyes once more, and cast them hurriedly over the landscape, and then, turning away, Philippi, with its visible mementoes

---

ence on the fortunes of the day. It was an interesting circumstance that my visit happened to fall in the precise month of the year (which is known from various data), in which this battle between theCaesareans and the Republicans was fought. Some difficulties I am led to say here, surround still the attempt to reconcile in all respects the present topography with the statements of the Roman and Greek writers, and even to bring the writers themselves into harmony with each other. There is work here still for the critical historian as well as the geographer. The fullest discussion of this subject which I have seen is found under *Philippi,* in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyklopädie.*

of so eventful a history, was lost to my sight forever. Descending from the "specular mount" to the level of the road, in a few moments I reached the brow of Symbolum, on the side towards Kavalla. From this point every step of the way was descending except a short distance along the shore. A few marketers were returning from the town into the country. I endeavored to ascertain the name of the stream (χειμαῤῥος) which rolled and foamed through the chasm on my right, but without success. A rapid walk of forty-five minutes brought me again to the hospitable abode of the English consul. I found that the road which leads from Kavalla to the top of Symbolum, bears W. N. W., and that from the top to Philippi, N. W. by N.

Statistics of Kavalla.

The foregoing statements embrace the leading results of the journey, in relation to the points on which I was most anxious to inform myself. But it may not be improper, in a miscellaneous Article of this description, to add a few items of a statistical or geographical nature, respecting a region so comparatively unknown to the generality of readers.

Kavalla has a population of five or six thousand, nine-tenths of which are Mussulmans, and the rest Greeks. One third of this number is an augmentation within the last ten years. Fifty or sixty Gipsy families live on the narrow plain between the town and the foot of Symbolum. The town consists of an inner or upper part, inclosed by a crenelated mediaeval wall, and an outer part, or suburb, also surrounded by a wall, but one of more recent construction. Even the outer wall does not include the entire promontory, but leaves the western slope outside, part of which is tilled, and the remainder is naked rock. Dr. Clarke, and others after him, speak of a harbor on the east side of the promontory, as well as on the west. There is no such harbor there, in use, at present. All the shipping is on the west side. So indifferent a roadstead as the one there, hardly deserves to be called a harbor.[1]

[1] Purdy's *Sailing Directory for the Mediterranean* makes no account whatever of any eastern harbor.

On the open ground near the aqueduct, wrestling matches, for which the athletes train themselves in due form and anoint their bodies after the manner of the old Greeks, are held, annually, in the spring. The people of the country assemble far and wide to witness the spectacle. Judges preside over the games, and the successful combatant is rendered famous for the rest of life.

A British vice-consulate was established here in 1858. Austrian, French, and Greek consuls have resided here for a long time. The principal articles of trade are tobacco and grain. The exports amount annually to about £360,000 sterling value, and the imports to £60,000. The district of Kavalla is one of the six divisions which make up the Sanjack, or province of Drama; the latter, again, being one of the two minor provinces which compose the pashalic of Salonica. The Sanjack of Drama is about eighty miles in length from east to west, and twenty-five or thirty in breadth. It is mainly separated from the more northern part of Turkey by the range of Mount Rhodope, which runs parallel to the coast line. It commences on the west, near the embouchure of the Strymon, and stretches along the seaboard a hundred miles to the east, including, besides Kavalla, the ports of Keremati and Lagos. The imports of the latter place are double those of Kavalla. The plain of Drama, or Philippi, is well adapted to every kind of cereal produce, and is already under such cultivation that large quantities of grain are shipped thence to other parts of Turkey, and to western Europe. It has been ascertained that cotton of the best quality can be raised there. A beginning has been made, and the prospect is, that, before many years, England (whose government is so attentive to these objects) will receive large supplies of that commodity from the ancient Macedonia. The city of Drama has twenty thousand inhabitants. The entire district is said to have a population of about two hundred thousand, three-fourths of whom are Mussulmans, and the rest Greeks and Gypsies, with a few Jews.

Anecdotes of Mohammed Ali.

The celebrated Mohammed Ali, Pasha of Egypt, was born at Kavalla, in 1769. The outline of this remarkable man's history must be familiar to every one. I learned a few particulars respecting him on the ground, which may not be so generally known. They may be told in few words, and certainly need not weary the reader.

The origin of Mohammed Ali was not so entirely obscure as some have represented. He belonged to one of the best families of Kavalla, but lost his father at an early age. He was reduced, at one time, to such a state of dependence that he served as a porter, or in some such menial capacity, in a warehouse at Thessalonica. The future viceroy, the conqueror of Syria and the Morea, actually began his career as a houseless wanderer, and a mendicant. It is honorable to the Pasha that he retained, through life, a warm attachment to the place of his birth. His countrymen always found him ready to advance their interests, either at home, or in his service abroad.[1]

He repaired the aqueduct which supplies the town with water, and put in order again the dilapidated road which leads to Drama on one side, and to Constantinople on the other. He strengthened the walls and fortifications, and would have enlarged the harbor; but the people were afraid of European immigration, and declined the offer. His most munificent act was to build and endow a substantial madresseh, or college, at a cost of three hundred purses — about £15,000 sterling. The edifice is a handsome stone structure, attracting the eye at once by its minarets and porticos, and forming the chief architectural ornament of the place. Three hundred scholars are taught and supported in this in-

[1] He was often importuned to befriend applicants who claimed to be his fellow-townsmen. The figure of a human head and face is to be seen on one of the street walls at Kavalla, which it requires some attention to observe. One of the Pasha's ways of identifying a Kavallian is said to have been, to ask him what was to be seen in a certain place there, and then challenge him to describe the object.

stitution, entirely without expense to themselves. Nor do these appropriations exhaust the resources of the college. The funds are so ample, that doles of bread and rice are given out, daily, to half the inhabitants of Kavalla. Two ship-loads of corn, and other fruits, are brought from Alexandria, every year, for these objects, being derived from an estate in Egypt set apart for the maintenance of the college. The chief branches of study are Arabic, arithmetic, geometry, and a knowledge of the Koran. Pupils are received here from all parts of Turkey. I was allowed to visit this school, and to make free inquiry respecting its condition and internal economy. A collateral descendant of the Pasha is the administrator of this public charity.

Mohammed Ali died in 1848, at the age of seventy-nine. The feelings of the old man yearned for a last sight of the home of his childhood; and, shortly before his death, he paid a final visit to his native place. The house in which he was born is still pointed out to the curious. It is uninhabited, but kept in repair at the expense of friends who honor his memory. The time-worn veteran, on landing, directed his steps at once to the ancestral abode. He had outlived his generation, and saw only the faces of strangers among those who gazed upon him. It would seem that his errand had respect to the past alone. He spent but a few hours on shore; and, having occupied these in religious worship, under the roof which first sheltered him, hastened back to his ship, and the next day departed for Egpyt.

Thasos and its Governor.

The island of Thasos, which lies in full view from Kavalla, is an appanage of the Egyptian vice-royalty. It was bestowed by the Sultan on Mohammed Ali, as a reward for his services against the Wahabees, a schismatic Arabian sect, from whom he recovered the holy Mohammedan places. The population, about ten thousand, is entirely Greek. The island is principally covered with pine forests, whence timber is shipped to Egypt for the public works of the government. Olive oil, honey, and wax are exported thence, in large

quantities. Its present governor, an Egyptian, resides at Kavalla, and is a man of uncommon intelligence, and liberally imbued with European ideas. The vice-consul being on familiar terms with his Excellency, it was easy for me to obtain an interview with him. In reply to the question, what were the greatest antiquities which he had found in Thasos, he answered: "The people themselves are the greatest curiosity; for they remain in the same condition in which their ancestors were more than two thousand years ago." There is some truth in this witticism. The inhabitants of the island are thoroughly Grecian; and the ancient manners and traditions linger among them, as in some of the other Greek islands, with remarkable distinctness and purity. Philologers say that the old form of the Greek future, which has been so generally displaced in the current Romaic, may be heard still, from the mouths of the peasants, in these rarely visited retreats of the Hellenic race.

Return to Athens.

In the course of the forenoon, Dec. 22, a steamer was signalized in the south-west, standing round Mount Athos for our port. It proved to be the Turkish steamer from Thessalonica to Constantinople, which, in consequence of the bad weather, had failed to come, as was expected, the previous week. The following day, at 10 o'clock A. M. I embarked for the Dardanelles, reconciled, as well as I could be, to the necessity of retracing, to some extent, familiar ground, and returning to Athens by way of Smyrna and Syra. The last views of the harbor and the coast were interesting and impressive. Pangaeus, with its snowy peaks, loomed up in the distance with a grandeur all its own. It was seen to consist of successive hills which lay back of each other far into the interior. The notch on the left of Kavalla, where the road crosses to the Plain of Philippi, was very striking. There is no other such depression, anywhere within sight, in the eastern line of the mountains which separate that Plain from the coast. The summits there fall apart, and leave an opening which affords the only practicable passage that rational men

could ever think of using as a thoroughfare. It was impossible for me to doubt, with this new evidence of so natural a communication between Philippi and the sea, that Kavalla, and no other place, must be the site of Neapolis, the ancient port of Philippi. As we receded further, the tops of Haemus came into view, glittering with snow-heaps which seemed piled up against the sky. Our track lay under the shores of Thasos. Such names as Lagos, Samothrace, Imbros, Lemnos, Troas, played an important part in the various tongues which were spoken on board. Early the next morning we passed Samothrace. This island was the resting-place, for a night, of the first Christian missionaries who crossed from Asia into Europe. Almost for the first time within two weeks, a cloudless sky hung over us, as we coasted along the fields of Troy. The "many-peaked Ida" displayed, proudly, the "snowy mantle" which she wore of old, when Homer's eye (who was not always blind) was turned thither. We were pursuing the track of Paul's vessel on his last voyage to Syria; and it happened to us, as was true in his case (Acts 20 : 14), that we stopped a night off against Mitylene. It was a strange sight, to see the hills behind Smyrna covered with snow, in contrast with the summer beauty with which I had seen them arrayed on a previous visit, in the month of June. A furious storm overtook us, on the passage to Syra; and the prudent captain turned back, and rode out the gale in one of the inlets of the Gulf of Smyrna. We were kept here from one midnight to another midnight. On proceeding thence we found ourselves, the next morning, opposite to Chios (*ἀντικρὺ Χίου*) the modern Scio.[1] No trace of the recent storm appeared in the sea, though threatening clouds deformed, still, the face of the sky. The clustering Cyclades lay around

[1] The reader will perceive that I have in this sentence changed hardly a word of Luke's *κἀκεῖθεν ἀποπλεύσαντες τῇ ἐπιούσῃ κατηντήσαμεν ἀντικρὺ Χίου* in Acts 20 : 14. I may be permitted to say that it was a source of constant interest to me on this circumnavigation (*περίπλους*) of the Aegean, as it proved so nearly to be, to read the maritime portions of Luke's narrative, and observe how many of the incidents of the voyage could be expressed in his language, and how nearly that language coincides with that which a well-educated Greek of the present day would employ in speaking of the same things.

us as we approached Delos. Syra, the central point of the steam-navigation of that part of the Mediterranean, had become almost twice as large, in the interval since 1852. We remained there a few hours, and then started on the last stage of the voyage. Amid thick darkness and torrents of rain, and through a labyrinth of islands on the right hand and left, the steamer plowed her way safely; and, after a run of ten hours, cast anchor in the Piraeus. Just a month had passed since I had embarked thence on this expedition to the apostolic places. It was a great transition to find myself once more amid the bustle and refinement of Athens, as compared with the desolate and semi-barbarous provinces which I had visited during my absence.

Attraction to the East.

After leaving Kavalla I found, in my portfolio, the following lines, which had been placed there by an intelligent lady in the family of Mr. Maling. For me they form, of course, a pleasing remembrancer of the journey and the friends it enabled me to make; but I venture to insert them here, in the hope that their interest will be found to consist not wholly in the peculiar circumstances which brought them into my possession. The language and sentiment will be seen to be the more fitting if I add that they refer, in part, to a previous journey of the writer, which had embraced Egypt and the Holy Land.

What secret current of man's nature turns
  Unto the golden *East*, with ceaseless flow?
Still where the sunbeam at its fountain burns,
  The pilgrim spirit would adore and glow.
Rapt in high thought, tho' weary, faint, and slow,
  Still doth the traveller thro' the deserts wind,
Led by those old Chaldean stars, which know
  Where passed the shepherd-fathers of mankind.
Is it some quenchless instinct, which, from far,
  Still points to where our *alienated home*
Lay in bright peace! O Thou true Eastern Star!
  Saviour! atoning Lord! where'er we roam,
Draw, still, our hearts to Thee; else, else, how vain
Their hope—the fair, lost birthright to regain!

INDEX.

A.

Abbott, Rev. J. J., 508.

Abel's Fall of the Kingdom of the Lombards, noticed, 660.

Aborigines of India, The, Article on, 709; our classes of men, spoken of by Herodotus as dwelling near the mouth of the Indus, 709; this diversity in the inhabitants of India, explained by the sacred writings of the Hindus' citations from the Vedic Hymns, 710; from the Brahmanas, 712; from the Epic poems and the writings of Menu, 712; from the Puranas, 714; sketch of the physical geography of India, 717; India, divided into three principal regions by mountain chains, 717; those tribes which are distinguished from the Brahman race, 719; the Bhotiyas or Bhots, 721; the Rawats, 722; the Khasiyas, 723; isolated tribes, the Chepang and Kusundu, 724; the Limbus and Lepchas, 725; the Kocch, Bodo and Dhimal tribes, 727; Garos or Garrows, 731; the Kuleis, 731; the Nagas, 731; tribes beyond the Indus, the Kafirs, 732; the Brahui, 734; the Bhils, 735; the Mirs and Minahs, 737; wild tribes of the northern Konkan, 738; the Ramusis, 739; the Badagas, 740; the Todas, 741; the Khonds, 743; the Kols, 748; the Shanars, 750; ethnical affinities of these tribes, 751.

Alexander's, J. A., Sermons, 671.

Alexander's, J. W., Letters, 671.

Ancient Church, its History, etc., 237.

Apostle Paul, a Witness for the Resurrection of Jesus, The, Article on, by Prof. George P. Fisher, 620; the resurrection of Christ the great miracle of Christianity, 620; a new line of defence of the genuineness of the New Testament, made necessary, 620; the relation of the conversion of Paul to Christian evidences, 622; the importance attached by Paul to the resurrection, a proof of the reality of Christ's resurrection, 624; Paul's intercourse with Peter, a proof that he testified as an eye-witness to the resurrection of Christ, 626; the Apostles, not deceived in their belief of the resurrection, 628; explanation of the testimony of the Apostles by the Tübingen critics, 630; refutation of Baur's theory of the origin of the canon and of Christianity, 633.

Arnold's History of Rhode Island, 427.

Atonement, Discourses and Treatises by Edward Smalley, etc., 235.

Augustine's Confessions, by Shedd, noticed, 670.

B.

Baird's Elohim Revealed, 664.

Bautain, on Extemporary Speaking, noticed, 234.

Barrows, Prof. E. P., 458.

Barber, Rev. A. D., 1.

Barrows, Rev. W., 323.

Biographical Literature, connected with the Centenary of Schiller's Birth, 409.

Boardman's Higher Christian Life, Article on, by Rev. Jacob J. Abbott, 508—535.

Boise, Prof. J. B., 634.

Book of the twelve Minor Prophets, noticed, 237.

Brewer Fiske, P., Letter from, 199.

C.

Church Theology and Free Inquiry in the Twelfth Century, Article on, by Rev. Seth Sweetser, D. D., 43.

Comparative Phonology; or, the Phonetic System of the Indo-European Languages, Article on, by Benjamin W. Dwight, 266; brief view of the Sanskrit Consonants in their relations to the other classical lan-

guages, 266; the gutturals, 266; palatals, 267; linguals peculiar to the Sanskrit, 267; dentals, 268; labials, 268; semi-vowels, 269; sibilants, 269; the consonantal system of the several classical languages, 271; the facts and laws that pertain to consonantal combinations, 272; styles and forms of consonantal changes, 274; substitution, of two kinds, 274; substitution in the case of palatals or gutturals, 274; of the linguals, 276; of the labials, 280; the aspirate H, 281; assimilative substitution, 281; consonantal insertions and additions, 286; changes by suppressions and abridgments, 290; weakened consonantal forms, 295; strengthened consonantal forms, 296; special pathological affections of the classical languages, 299; the Greek dialects, 299; the phonetic force of the different Greek letters, 817; special pathological affections of the Greek, 827; digammation, 827; sibilation, 831; aspiration, 833; aspirates in Latin, 836; reduplication, 840; in Greek, 841; in Latin, 844; nasalization, 846; nasalization in Latin, 849; the phonetic force of the Latin letters, 849; equivalents in Sanskrit, to the Latin, 851.

Concord of Ages, noticed, 419.

D.

Dawson's Archaia, noticed, 443.

Did the Ancient Hebrews believe in the Doctrine of Immortality? Article on, by Rev. S. Tuska, 787; arguments for the affirmative of this question, 789; the first argument, from the universality of the belief, 789; ignorance of the doctrine impossible, from the long residence of the Hebrews in Egypt, 791; the Hebrews did not learn the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, 792; the Hebrews must have had the idea of immortality, independently of all foreign sources, 794; the prevalent idea that the dead could be conjured up, 795; Hebrew ideas of the soul, 796; ignorance of the Hebrews as to the distinction between matter and spirit, 798; allusions to a future state in the Hebrew Scriptures, 801; the translation of Enoch, 801; allusions to the doctrine in the Psalms, 806; in the Book of Job, 809; in Ecclesiastes, 812; the force of these arguments cannot be set aside, 814.

Disquisitions and Notes on the Gospels, noticed, 669.

Divine Human in the Scriptures, The, noticed, 443.

Dwight's Higher Christian Education, noticed, 230.

Dwight, B. W., Articles by, 266, 817.

E.

Editorial Correspondence, 199.

Ehrenfeuchter's Practical Theology, noticed, 400.

Emmons's, Dr. Works, 234, 449.

Exegesis of 1 *Corinthians*, 15 : 35—44, *as illustrated by Natural History and Chemistry*, Article, by Rev. Edward Hitchcock, 303; three leading objects in view in the passage, 303; the first object, answer to an objection, 303; answer drawn from the germination and growth of a seed, 304; identity preserved by means of even the smallest particles and in spite of all changes of these particles, 304; this idea controverted by Prof. Haven, 306; by Rev. E. H. Sears, 307; the second object to show the difference between the natural and the spiritual body, 309; the third object to show the superior glory of the spiritual over the natural body, 309; the passage proves a specific identity between the natural and the spiritual body, 310.

F.

Fisher, Prof. G. P., 620.

Fleury's Ecclesiastical History, 435.

Ford, Rev. D. B., 535.

Fuller's Sermons, noticed, 235.

G.

Gospel in Leviticus, by Geiss, 393.

Gulliver, Rev. J. P., 355.
Graham Lectures, by Huntington, 235.

H.

Hackett's, Prof., Notes on Philemon, noticed, 666, Article by, 866.
Hamann, John George, Article on, by Rev. J. M. Hoppin, 313; sketch of his life, 313; Hamann kept the faith, though he saw fit to hide it, 317; an independent thinker, 318; sketch of his philosophy, 319; extract from his works, 321.
Hase's Life of Jesus, noticed, 396.
History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism, noticed, 237.
Historical Books of the Holy Scriptures, noticed, 448.
Hitchcock's Religion of Geology, 229.
History of the Literature of the French Revolution, noticed, 653.
Hickok, Rev. L. P., D. D., 64.
Hitchcock, Rev. E., D. D., 303.
Hoppin, Rev. J. M., 313.
Hymnology, Article on, 134—198.

J.

Journey to Neapolis and Philippi, Article, by Prof. Horatio B. Hackett, 866; plan of the journey, 866; arrival at Kavalla, 867; historical associations, 868; excursion to Philippi, 869; crossing of Symbolum, 870; plain of Philippi, 871; ancient monument, 872; river of Philippi, 873; the present ruins of Philippi, 875.

K.

Kingsley's Sermons, noticed, 228.

L.

Lectures on the English Language, 449.
Lamson, Dr., on the Church of the First Three Centuries, noticed, 665.
Limits of Religious Thought Adjusted, by Rev. L. P. Hickok, D. D., 64; the question, how we may attain the thought of a being who is infinite and absolute, 64; the present state of speculation on this question, 65; Sir W. Hamilton's views, 65; Mansel's views, 66; the ground for faith as laid by Hamilton, 69; objections to his doctrine, 71; the ground of faith as given by Mansel, 73; his assumption that God is both infinite and absolute, 73; consequences resulting from his doctrine of sustaining faith, 75; true origin of the want of a God, 83; a capability to give limits, a peculiar and specific function of the intellect, 84; another function, its capability to put phenomena together, and make of them a connected order of experience, 86; the reason, distinct from all other intellectual faculties, 88; the reason alone can apprehend the infinite and the absolute, 89.
Literary History of the Eighteenth Century by Hettner, noticed, 646.
Long, Rev. Clement, D. D., 111.

M.

Michelet's History of Mankind, 643.
M'Cosh on the Intuitions, 661.
Missionary Spirit of the Psalms and Prophets, The, Article on, by Prof. E. P. Barrows, 457; the covenant with Abraham had respect to all nations, 458; the attitude of the Mosaic economy towards the Gentiles, one of love, 459; its final end, the salvation of all nations, 460; the prophets predict the conversion of the Gentiles, 461; these predictions relate to Christianity and not Judaism, 462; religion in all ages, essentially the same, but circumstantially different, 463; the spirit of these prophecies, not foreign to that of Christianity, 464; God always carries on a two-fold line of administration, 465; the outward or providential line, 466; the inward or spiritual, 466; both these lines committed to Christ, 468; the Messianic prophecies of Christ's kingly office all relate to the universality of his dominion, 468; the Psalms and Prophets full of the missionary spirit, 470; illustrative passages from the Prophets, 471; Isaiah 25 : 6—12, 471; verse 6, 472; v. 7, 472; v. 8, 473; vs.

9 and 10, 474; vs. 11 and 12, 475; Isaiah 60, 477; Zephaniah 2, 478; Malachi, 479; Zechariah 14: 16—21, 480; meaning of the phrase, "all the families of the earth," 481; objections to Henderson's view of its meaning, 482; passages from the Psalms, 483; Psalm 22, 483; the whole costume of the passage thoroughly Jewish, 484; Ps. 96, 485; Ps. 67, 487; vs. 1 and 2, 487; vs. 3 and 4, 488; vs. 5, 6 and 7, 489; Ps. 87, 489; vs. 1, 2 and 3, 490; v. 4, 491; vs. 5, 6 and 7, 492; sense in which all the nations of the earth are born in Zion, 493.

Modern Greek Language, The, Article on, by Prof. J. B. Boise, 634; increased attention to the languages of Greece and Rome, in reference to their affinities with other languages, 634; increased attention to the languages with which the Greek and Latin are connected, 635; increased attention to Modern Greek in Germany, 636; Pott's treatise on Ancient Greek in Modern Calabria, 636; etymological observations from a German publication in relation to Modern Greek, 638.

Monod's Saint Paul, noticed, 437.

Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb, noticed, 659.

Moral Philosophy by Haven, 236.

N.

Nature of Evangelical Faith, The, Article on, by Prof. Egbert C. Smyth, 494; notice of Hare's work on the Nature of Faith, 494; faith not a mere belief on the ground of testimony, 495; men of intellectual pursuits, apt to adopt this error, 496; sometimes adopted by pious men, 496; true faith always unto righteousness, 497; an intellectual element present in true faith, 498; the action of the intellect precedes the full belief of the heart, 499; this idea the source of confusion of thought in regard to faith, 499; faith a single and simple act of the mind, 500; scriptural proof that faith includes an act of the will as well as of the understanding, 501; Romans 10: 10, 501; the same idea implied in the original meaning of the word rendered *faith*, 502; also in the effects ascribed to faith, 502; the true idea of any subject, always light-giving, 503; this idea accounts for the great stress laid upon the influences of the Holy Spirit, 503; faith, if it is with the heart, must be product of a divine influence, 505; the true idea of faith accounts for its presence with the poor and unlearned, and its frequent absence from the cultivated, 506; this idea explains how men are accountable for their faith, 506; all faith which is not moral, lacking in the essential characteristic of gospel faith, 507.

O.

Owen's Commentaries on Luke and John, noticed, 667.

Objections from Reason against the Endless Punishment of the Wicked, Article by Clement Long, D. D. 111—134.

P.

Park, E. A. pp. 134—199, 217—230, 392—396, 664—672.

Paul, the Preacher, noticed, 235.

Political Economy, by Bascom, 236.

Pronunciation and Accentuation of the Latin Language, noticed, 233.

Puritans, The, by Hopkins, 238, 448.

Pyramid, The Great, noticed, 445.

R.

Rambles Among Words, noticed, 229.

Rawlinson's Bampton Lectures, 439.

Religious Life and Opinions of John Milton, The, Article on, by Rev. A. D. Barber, 1—42.

Recent works on Materialism, 201.

Religion of Geology, The, Article on, 673; important discoveries, apt to be met with incredulity and opposition, 673; three classes of opinions in regard to the connection between science and religion, 673; the first class consider the language

of the Bible as scientifically correct, 674; the second class, sceptics or atheists, 675; the third class believe the Bible and the leading principles of science, to be mutually consistent, 676; opinions advanced in the last edition of The Religion of Geology, 678; arguments drawn from geology for the existence of God, 678; the hypothesis of the eternal series, refuted, 681; preliminary principles, 681; direct geological arguments, 682; interpretation, in the light of geology, of the parts of the Bible relating to the physical history of the earth, 683; citation of passages from the Lectures in regard to the cosmogony, 684; symbolical theory of days, 688; the biblical account of the creation, a succession of pictures, 689; the sacred writers, not bound to give the true chronological order of creation, 690; evil in the world before man, 696; zoölogy and geology throw doubt over the literal universality of the deluge of Noah, 697; geology teaches that the earth may be destroyed by fire, 698; arguments from geology for the Divine benevolence, 698; geology proves prospective benevolence, 699; geology proves and illustrates miraculous and special providence, 701; geology proves the fallen condition of the world, 705; geology presents enlarged views of the divine plans, 706.

Reuchlin's History of Italy, 659.

Resurrection and its Concomitants, The, Article on, by Rev. E. Russell, 755; Paul's discourse on Mars Hill, 755; the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, has been most fiercely assailed, 757; statement of the common doctrine of the resurrection, 757; objections to this doctrine, 759; objected, that the dead cannot come forth from their graves, seeing they are not there, 759; the Saviour does not affirm that all are in graves, 760; no collection of the original elements of bodies needed, 762; second objection, what body of the man will be raised at the resurrection, 764; objected, that the scriptures do not define the body of the resurrection so as to give men any conception of it, 771; objected, that there will be no need of the resurrection of the body from the grave, 774; meaning of the term ἀνάστασις, 775; how was the term understood by the audience on Mars Hill? 777; the doctrine of the resurrection at Corinth, 778; wicked men will be raised, 781; citation of passages from the New Testament, as to the term ἀνάστασις, 782.

Romanism and a free Bible, Article on, by Rev. William Barrows, 323; antagonistic theories of the Protestants and Catholics as to the use of the Bible, 323; the principle of the Romanists, that the Bible is not for the people, 324; evidence that this is their principle, 324; historical account of the rise and growth of this principle, 234; effect of the art of printing in preventing the suppression of the Bible, 327; the Reformation does not prevent the suppression of the Bible, 330; suppression of the Bible in Spain, 332; the Rhemish Testament and the Douay Bible, 333; opposition of Rome to Bible Societies, 336; reasons given by the Romanists in favor of their policy, 340; citations from more ancient authors, 340; from more modern authors, "The Clifton Tracts," 343; from Dixon's Introduction, 346; Dr. Wiseman's Review, 349; the question of the use of the Bible in schools, 353.

Rothe's Ethics, Article on, by Rev. C. C. Tiffany, 241; Rothe's character as an author, 241; origin of his Ethics, 242; the nature and relative value of speculative thought, 243; speculation as distinguished from reflection, 244; the starting point of speculative theology, 246; the relations of speculative theology, first, to religion, 247; second, to dogma, 248; third, to the Bible, 249; the relation of theological eth-

ics to philosophical ethics, 250; to dogmatic theology and Biblical Ethics, 250; the basis of theological ethics, 251; method by which an idea of God, absolute and infinite, can be gained, 252; we must begin with the thought of the absolute, 252; God determines himself, to a process of development, 254; he determines himself, both as subject and object, 254; God exists in the three modi, of Being, Nature, and Personality, 256; divine attributes, arising from the relation of God to himself, 256; God, the absolute and perfect in himself, 257: an inherent necessity in God to create, 258; this necessity, moral and not physical, 258; the different circles of creation correspond to each other, 262; creation not to be spoken of as beginning, 262; God's attributes as related to an existent world, 262; general features of Rothe's work, 265.

Russell, Rev. E., D. D., 755.

Rutenberg's (Otto von) History of the Baltic Provinces of Liveland, Esthland, and Curland, noticed, 213.

S.

Schaff's (Prof.) Hymn Book, 233.

Schlözer's (Von) Frederic the Great, noticed, 214.

Scriptural evidence of the Deity of Christ, Article on, by Rev. David B. Ford, 535—574.

Sears, Rev. Barnas, D. D., president of Brown University, pp. 201—214, 397—418, 643—660.

Smith's Chronological Tables, 230.

Smyth, Prof. E. C., 494.

Stier's Words of Jesus, noticed, 440.

Sweetser, Rev. S., D. D., 43.

T.

Taylor, Samuel H., pp. 440, 443—448, 449—51, 658.

Taylor, Dr. N. W., on Moral Government in the Abstract, Article by Rev. John P. Gulliver, 355; central idea of a system of theology, constructed on the ideal of Dr. Taylor, 355; object of the Article, 357; Dr. Taylor's meaning of the word "action," 357; what is a moral government? 358; his definition considered, 359; the law of a perfect government requires benevolence as the best kind of action, 361; benevolence the sum of obedience, and selfishness the sum of disobedience, 366; a perfect moral government expresses a preference for the action required, all things considered, 370; involves sanctions, 372; definition of legal sanctions, 374; office of legal sanction, 375; objections answered, 390; Syllabus of Dr. Taylor's treatise, 452–6.

Theism and the modern sceptical Theories, noticed, 336.

Theology of Sophocles, The, Article on, by Prof. William S. Tyler, 575; allusion to the life and circumstances and character of Sophocles, 575; the extant works of Sophocles, 579.

Theremin's Rhetoric, noticed, 226.

Tiffany, Rev. C. C., 241.

Twofold Life of Jesus Christ, by Rev. J. T. Tucker, 95.

Tyler's, Dr., Memoir and Lectures, noticed, 217, 575.

Tyler's, Prof. Two Works, noticed, 668, Article by, 575—619.

Tullock's Leaders of the Reformation, noticed, 234.

Tucker, Rev. J. T., 95.

Tuska, Rev. S., 787.

U.

Undergraduate, The, noticed, 447.

V.

Vindication of the Government of the New England Churches, 670.

Vital Christians of the Lutheran Church, noticed, 397.

W.

Winer's Grammar of the New Testament, noticed, 215.

Wilson, Bishop, Life of, noticed, 442.

Worcester's and Webster's Dictionaries, noticed, 668.